The Political Potential of Women's Voluntary Activity in Refugee Support Work

Care-Ethical Approaches to the Negotiation of Difference

Dissertation

Zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades

doctor philosophiae (Dr. phil.)

im Fach Politikwissenschaft

eingereicht am 02.07.2019

an der Kultur-, Sozial- und Bildungswissenschaftlichen Fakultät der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

von

Sophia Schmid, M.Sc.

Prof. Dr.-Ing. Dr. Sabine Kunst
Präsidentin der
Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

Prof. Dr. Christian Kassung
Dekan der Kultur-, Sozial- und
Bildungswissenschaftlichen Fakultät

Gutachterin / Gutachter:

1. Prof. Dr. Naika Foroutan

2. Prof. Dr. Christine Bauhardt

Tag der mündlichen Prüfung: 01.11.2019

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor Prof. Naika Foroutan for putting great confidence in me at the start and throughout my journey and for continuously opening up new and unknown perspectives and encouraging me to believe in myself. I would also like to thank Prof. Elisabeth Conradi and Prof. Maila Stivens for sharing their knowledge and thus providing invaluable inspiration. Thanks to Prof. Christine Bauhardt who agreed to act as my second grader. I would also like to express particular gratitude to Dr. Serhat Karakayali and Dr. J. Olaf Kleist for providing me with all three waves of the EFA data and for the opportunity to profit from their insightful and intriguing work. I also thank Sana Shah, your professional and personal advice helped me immensely at crucial points in the last two years. I am also thankful to Dr. Nader Talebi and everyone else who provided me with crucial input on the content, structure and style of my papers.

I feel very grateful to all the impressive and inspiring women who participated in my study. This work would not exist without your remarkable openness. Thank you for sharing your experiences with me and the world, and for the valuable and urgent work you are putting so much effort in.

I owe great debt to my family, who supported me in every sense. Only you know how big an achievement it is for me to hand in this dissertation and, relying on your invaluable encouragement, to have overcome the intense challenges of the past years. Stefan – thanks for bearing with me when I struggled, for your epic patience and your unfailing belief in me. Your emotional support and care kept me motivated to follow through with this project and will sustain me in the years to come. To all my friends, without your love and understanding I would have never gotten to where I am today. Thank you so much for being there for me.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the immense privilege that underpins all of my achievements. Unfortunately, our oppressive social structures still prevent many brilliant women and other disadvantaged groups to fully exploit their potential.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Being discussed controversially for decades, particularly in the last years immigration seemed to become firmly associated with a sense of crisis (Dines, Montagna, & Vacchelli, 2018; Karakayali, 2018a). In Europe, the immigration crisis superseded the financial crisis as the dominant discourse of anxiety, when the arrival of refugees escalated a long-simmering aversion to cultural difference (Gupta & Virdee, 2018). After Germany's initial welcoming attitude, right-wing populist and anti-immigrant movements increasingly challenge the so far largely liberal, open and tolerant discourse towards refugees (Holmes & Castaneda, 2016; Vollmer & Karakayali, 2017).

In the wake of these developments, multiculturalism as the dominant approach to accommodate minorities has been called into question, most notably by Angela Merkel who in 2010 declared it 'failed, absolutely failed'. However, unconditional political equality and respect for minority rights remain key characteristics of a liberal, democratic society that Germany claims to be. While many alternatives and redevelopments of multiculturalism have been proposed in academic literature (e.g., Anthias, 2002; Brubaker, 2001; Holtug, 2017; Kukathas, 2003; Meer & Modood, 2012; Rattansi, 2012; Saharso, 2003; Torres, 1998; Zapata-Barrero, 2016), none of them appeared to be able to halt the xenophobic and anti-immigrant stance that national and local politics currently seem to drift towards. Therefore, additional strategies and discourses to deal with refugees, immigration and cultural difference in general are urgently needed. The efforts required from the majority society to ensure successful immigration especially have not been sufficiently discussed yet (Foroutan, 2015). My PhD study takes up this challenge and aims to find alternative successful ways of dealing with immigration by examining a group who is particularly exposed to refugees and migrants. The project focuses on female refugee support work (RSW) volunteers and investigates their practices, attitudes and individual approaches when working with refugees to find guidance on how to preserve an open and tolerant outlook to cultural difference on a political and societal level as well.

As studies from 2015 and 2016 show, female volunteers are vastly overrepresented in RSW, (see Karakayali & Kleist, 2016). The specific case and sample of female RSW volunteers in Germany was chosen as on the one hand, they spend their free time to help refugees and migrants and thus at least initially, they might have been particularly convinced of the ideal of a diverse, tolerant society,. On the other hand, they are directly and regularly exposed to the conflicts and challenges associated with multiple axes of difference while volunteering in sometimes difficult settings like a refugee camp. I would argue that the challenges even they cannot resolve need to be addressed most fundamentally. Moreover, both as women and as volunteers, they have been a prime target of right-wing populists and thus potentially encountered fierce resistance to their world-view. Furthermore, there has been evidence that

gender plays a role in attitudes towards immigration, with some suggesting that women might be more open to diversity (Beutel & Marini, 1995; Boulila & Carri, 2017; Nava, 2002; Stivens, 2018). Mostly being part of German majority groups and often representing the upper segment of society (Institut für Demoskopie Allensbach, 2017), these female volunteers constitute an ideal research focus to examine possible contributions of mainstream society to the successful immigration of refugees and immigrants.

Consequently, the overarching research questions this PhD study addresses include:

- What role does gender play in RSW?
- How do female RSW volunteers experience and construct difference and similarity in their day-to-day work with refugees, both consciously and unconsciously?
- How do the research subjects overcome potential experience of difference and challenges in their work?
- How could these strategies be applied on a larger scale?

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

REFUGEE SUPPORT WORK IN GERMANY

When the number of asylum seekers in Germany increased dramatically with a high point of 745,545 requests for asylum in 2016 compared to only 30,100 ten years earlier (Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge, 2019), the topic suddenly exploded in the political and public discourse. Most notably, an unprecedented wave of empathy resulted in the establishment of numerous local, spontaneous initiatives aiming to support arriving refugees, as well as the broadening of refugee support in existing welfare organisations. Indeed, comparing their results to the report of the same survey from the year before (Karakayali & Kleist, 2015), Karakayali and Kleist (2016) found that in the 'summer of welcome' in 2015, a large number of new volunteers changed the composition of the refugee support movement dramatically from a niche cause to a mainstream activity. In the immediate aftermath, research institutes and public foundations mainly published investigative reports into the phenomenon that was commonly perceived as novel (e.g., Ahrens, 2017; Aumüller, Daphi, & Biesenkamp, 2015; Eisnecker & Schupp, 2016; Hamann, Karakayali, Wallis, & Höfler, 2016; Institut für Demoskopie Allensbach, 2017; Karakayali & Kleist, 2016; Speth & Becker, 2016). Then, scholars started to conduct more theory-driven academic analyses of German RSW mainly on specific case studies and the local organisation of voluntary work (e.g., Bock, 2018; Heins & Unrau, 2018; Nowicka, Krzyzowski, & Ohm, 2019), or the evolution of the discourse on the societal and political level (e.g., Friese, 2017; Funk, 2016; Holmes & Castaneda, 2016; Holzberg, Kolbe, & Zaborowski, 2018; Karakayali, 2018a; Vollmer & Karakayali, 2017).

Regarding the political implications of RSW in Germany, Braun (2017) illustrated the complex power dynamics between volunteers and refugees that keep up gendered and racialized inequalities deeply embedded in structural hierarchies. Paper Two of this PhD project carries forward this aspect by uncovering the hidden differentiation mechanisms that cross-cut volunteers' relationships with refugees more or less openly. However, going beyond Braun's (2017) decolonial perspective, it analyses othering processes through gender and 'culture' more explicitly and relates these to processes of 'saming' that are neglected in Braun's (2017) paper. Moreover, Fleischmann and Steinhilper (2017) showed that contrary to RSW's oftentimes humanitarian framing, it possesses high political potential, although often implicit. Karakayali (2017) concurred by arguing that debates around inequalities and exclusion are still part of mainstream voluntary work after 2015. The PhD study shows that this political aspect is particularly instrumental for female volunteers, who interpret their care work as civic action too.

In addition, the research project further illuminates the role of gender in RSW and in the refugee debate more generally, a pressing issue that should receive more attention (Karakayali, 2018b; Kulaçatan, 2016; Stivens, 2018; Tudor, 2018). Volunteerism research revealed that female and male patterns and motivations of volunteering differ (Gil-Lacruz, Marcuello, & Saz-Gil, 2019; Helms & McKenzie, 2014; Wilson, 2012). While men tend to volunteer more in the public domain or the workplace, women more tend to perform caring tasks in the private sphere, schools or churches (Musick & Wilson, 2008; Vogel, Simonson, Ziegelmann, & Tesch-Römer, 2017). The reasons for these differences have been discussed controversially, with some pointing to structural factors (Einolf, 2011; Gerstel, 2000) and others attributing them to socialisation patterns (Themudo, 2009; Wilson & Musick, 1997).

The above-cited German studies of RSW have only incidentally considered gender (e.g., Braun, 2017) and have thus left open a critical gap in the literature. Here, this project ties in with feminist solidarity with anti-racist causes (Boulila & Carri, 2017; Dietze, 2017; Farris, 2016). Incidents such as the events of New Year's Eve 2015/16 in Cologne point to the salience of gender in the German discourse on refugees that warrants further attention. Paper Two in particular untangles the gendered subtexts that underlie a considerable part of the hostility against refugees. Moreover, the project uncovers RSW as a potential site of political activism against racism for women. Apart from shedding light on women's political participation, it engages with the controversial, as of yet undecided question of women's role in defending a liberal and tolerant world order. Although some studies showed that German women tend to be as or even more racist than men (Zick, Küpper, & Krause, 2016), others found evidence that women tend to increasingly vote for left wing parties in Europe and less for the AfD in Germany (Giebler & Regel, 2018; Giger, 2009), are more supportive of minority groups (Beutel & Marini, 1995) and have historically been more supportive of inclusion

(Nava, 2002). While the present research also points into the latter direction, this debate remains fraught with difficulties, not least because of the essentialisation and perpetuation of traditional gender stereotypes.

Finally, both politics and the academic literature have abundantly celebrated and idealised the refugee support movement (Vollmer & Karakayali, 2017). In doing so, the more controversial and problematic side of the volunteer work has often been overlooked, particularly in public discourse. The recent years have seen a surge of studies and reports on right-wing xenophobia and racism, but similar tendencies in more mainstream settings and institutions are still vehemently rejected in the German public (Amir-Moazami, 2016; Boulila & Carri, 2017; Rommelspacher, 2002). Along with others pointing to problematic patterns in RSW (Braun, 2017; Erickson, 2012; Heins & Unrau, 2018; Omwenyeke, 2016), Paper Two brings into focus more hidden and subtle rejection of difference.

Before delving into the theoretical framework, it is paramount to defend the analytical approach taken. Although integration and migration studies encompass a broad range of disciplines, they so far rarely collaborate and combine approaches (Castles, 2010). This arguably results in missed opportunities to provide fully comprehensive analyses on integration and migration. Instead of viewing the eclectic combination of different theoretical schools as a deficit, this research project explicitly interrelates several perspectives to illuminate the dynamics of RSW. It combines political science, feminist studies, sociology, social psychology, postcolonialism and philosophy across its three papers. The concentration on the distinctly interdisciplinary ethics of care forms part of this theoretical approach (Klaver, van Elst, & Baart, 2014). At least since Joseph Carens' (2013) much-noticed study of the 'ethics of immigration' it seems clear that seemingly abstract philosophical contemplations are pivotal in political deliberations on migration. The following section will thus touch on various relevant insights but due to space constraints will not be able to present each theory in as much detail and depth as similar, more theory-focussed studies do.

Social psychological concepts of shared identity

To investigate bonding processes between volunteers and refugees, this PhD project draws on social psychological concepts of intergroup relations, social identity and prejudice. While sociological literature on group dynamics mostly concentrates on boundary making and differentiation, social psychology sees its mission in overcoming perceptions of difference and prejudice (Dovidio, 2001). It therefore describes in-depth the conditions and processes of establishing commonality which guide this study's theoretical and empirical approaches to 'sameness'.

The field of intergroup relations drew increased interest in the 1950s, when under the impression of World War II social psychologists turned their attention to intergroup conflict

and cognitive biases. In this first wave of the study of prejudice, the focus was mainly on identifying and measuring prejudice to then find ways to eradicate the problem (Dovidio, 2001). Particularly influential was Allport's (1954) study on 'The Nature of Prejudice'. He defined prejudice as "an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization" (Allport, 1954, p. 9). Perceiving prejudice as a cognitive error, Allport outlined a method to reduce prejudice which is known as intergroup contact theory. He claimed that intergroup contact can reduce prejudice when four conditions are given: "equal group status within the situation; common goals; intergroup cooperation; and the support of authorities, law, or custom" (Pettigrew, 1998, p. 66). Subsequent research found abundant support for Allport's hypothesis, however often adding additional conditions that ultimately risked rendering the theory ineffectual apart from the specific situation at hand (Kenworthy, Turner, Hewstone, & Voci, 2005; Pettigrew, Tropp, Wagner, & Christ, 2011).

In the 1970s, a new generation of social psychologists led by Henri Tajfel (1981), Thomas F. Pettigrew (2007) and John C. Turner (1987) conceived prejudice as a normal and necessary cognitive process of categorization that is instrumental for belonging. Social Identity Theory (SIT), treating group memberships as part of self-concepts, emerged as a new theoretical instrument (Pettigrew, 2007; Turner & Oakes, 1986). SIT specifies that to uphold positive self-esteem, people tend to compare their ingroups with outgroups using often discriminatory stereotypes (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Moreover, these categorizations help simplify and order the world in ambiguous situations (Tajfel, 1981). As a consequence, Turner (1987) developed Self-Categorization Theory, which maintains that to construct their identity, people categorize themselves into groups on different levels that become salient depending on the specific situation.

Next, Gaertner and Dovidio (1986) initiated a 'third wave' of research. Blatant, overt prejudice was disappearing slowly, but it gave rise to more subtle and hidden expressions of bias (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995; Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). Gaertner and Dovidio (1986) termed this form of prejudice 'aversive racism', which denotes cognitive biases that even those considering themselves non-prejudiced possess. Correspondingly, they developed a new model of prejudice reduction, the Common Ingroup Identity Model (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2005). To reduce prejudice, they maintained, a common, more inclusive group identity also involving former outgroup members needs to be established, as it will ultimately extend positive ingroup bias to those formerly excluded. This can be achieved, for example, through Allport's conditions, but also through common superordinate group memberships, or other factors perceived to be shared such as a common fate (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2005; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Paper Two draws on this model to interpret research subjects' attempts to establish connections and similarities with the refugees. Its empirical part carves out abstract and concrete strategies the volunteers pursue to create a shared identity. It thus applies

Gaertner and Dovidio's theory to a real-life empirical setting, as opposed to the experimental conditions social psychological concepts are usually tested in. The PhD research thus advances the model by showing its resonance in more complex, dynamic and ambivalent social settings and tests it with a different methodological approach.

Nevertheless, Paper Two critiques social psychology for neglecting much of the social dynamics that complicate experimental findings in real-world settings. The research particularly challenges social-psychological ideas of common identity facilitating multiculturalism (Holtug, 2017; Kunst, Thomsen, Sam, & Berry, 2015). Social psychology arguably fails to adequately take into consideration discourse and social dynamics (Branney, 2008; Hook & Howarth, 2005; Leach, 2002). More specifically, Paper Two posits constructions of difference as inescapable and pervasively intersecting constructions of common identity. It thus argues that common identity is not sufficient for reducing intergroup hostility as it does not pay adequate attention to difference.

POSTSTRUCTURALIST, FEMINIST AND POSTCOLONIAL ACCOUNTS OF DIFFERENCE

While literature on difference has been discussed extensively for several decades, a renewed interest in shared identities and commonality has started to push back at the turn of the century (Alba & Nee, 2003; Brubaker, 2001; Putnam, 2007). This study however maintains that difference continues to intersect constructions of commonality, particularly concerning migrants and refugees, and should thus continue to be the focus of further academic research in 21st century superdiverse spaces. Paper Two demonstrates a need for a new model to negotiate and contain these differences to counter the anti-immigrant and xenophobic attacks rampant today.

The paper enters the field of difference through poststructuralism, which emerged as a reaction to Ferdinand de Saussure's (1949) structuralism. Saussure (1949) postulated that binary differences between signs arbitrarily generate meaning in an abstract linguistic structure. The poststructuralist movement, led by Jacques Derrida (2002 (1972)) contested this highly rigid, abstract model. Instead, using the neologism 'différance' Derrida (1982) argued that meaning is constantly shifting in 'play' along multiple scales. A conflation of the words 'to differ' and 'to defer', 'différance' denotes "the movement according to which language, or any code, any system of referral in general, is constituted "historically" as a weave of differences." (Derrida, 1982, p. 12) Most importantly, Derrida (2002 (1972)) demonstrated that the construction of meaning implies a power relation where one term dominates the other. His strategy of deconstruction demands the reversal and transgression of this hierarchy (Culler, 1983) and spilt over from linguistics into philosophy and politics.

The political significance of this argument was soon recognised by feminist and postcolonial thinkers who challenged the subjugation and domination of underprivileged groups such as

women and immigrants. Firstly, feminists such as Simone de Beauvoir (2011 (1949)) or Luce Irigaray (1994) showed how women throughout history have been positioned as 'other' to men and thereby oppressed by patriarchy. From the outset, feminism focused more intensely on the power relations resulting from difference and alterity (Currie, 2004). Another feminist proposition relevant for my purposes is feminism's attack on binary gender systems and the ensuing complication of identities and difference (Gunew & Yeatman, 1993). As part of poststructural feminism, Irigaray (1980) urged for the recognition of the plurality and complexity of women's voices to break through the barriers of patriarchal culture. This questioning of universal identity was pursued more forcefully by feminists of colour such as bell hooks (1981) or Audre Lorde (1984). They argued that white women habitually assumed a universal female identity that neglected other women's experiences and struggles with racialized power hierarchies. Intersectional feminism thus examines the interplay of different social categories in systems of oppression and identity construction (Andersen, 2010; Crenshaw, 1989). This PhD project relates these insights to social-psychological conceptions of 'common identity' in exposing how other positionalities continually intersect these in complex, often hidden ways and ultimately cannot simply be bypassed in the name of prejudice reduction. It concurs with feminist transnational psychology that critiques traditional psychology's neglect of intersectionality and Non-Western experiences (Kurtiş & Adams, 2015). Moreover, it takes inspiration from transnational feminism's call for the acknowledgement of difference also within political projects (Mohanty, 2003) and suggests that even though the revelation of commonality may be an intuitively suitable tool to reduce prejudice, as it is for my research subjects, it will not solve political and social conflicts in the long run.

Intersectional and transnational feminism heavily draws on postcolonial analyses, which in turn have been influenced considerably by poststructuralism (Hiddleston, 2010). Using Derrida's deconstruction, postcolonialism exposes the mechanisms through which the dominant West constructs minority and Non-Western groups as inferior 'others' (Hall, 1992). These 'constitutive outsides' are essential to produce meaning and define personal and collective identities in processes of 'boundary marking' (Hall, 1997; Rutherford, 1990). Boundary lines today are mostly framed as 'culture' in over-simplified, often binary oppositions that try to uphold stable, homogeneous group identities (Gilroy, 2000; Hall, 1992). These are in turn threatened by the ambiguity and contradictions of real life differences (Bhabha, 1983). These processes are often triggered by the incessant change and accompanying anxiety that characterise our globalised world and are particularly well represented in the figure of the refugee (Rutherford, 1990, 2007). The postcolonial concept of difference thus explains the deep entrenchment of particularly 'cultural' differences in the accounts of the research participants, even when they try to establish a common identity. IN contrast, postcolonialism often focuses on the construction of majority group identity in

opposition to Non-Western groups. This PhD project however also illuminates the research subject's attempt to include these minority groups in majority identity construction processes.

THE ETHICS OF CARE

The main body of literature this PhD project, particularly in Paper One and Three, draws on to resolve the discord between sameness and difference encompasses the field of the ethics of care. Its emergence has mostly been attributed to psychologist Carol Gilligan (1982), who demonstrated that girls discussed moral dilemmas differently to boys and emphasised relationships, responsibility, the needs of others and care. She argued that this 'different voice' is by no means inferior to boys' style of reasoning which highlights separation, autonomy, justice and fairness. This distinction between an 'ethics of care' and an 'ethics of justice' was however quickly criticised for reifying the binary gender structure and stereotypes tying women to the private sphere (Engster, 2007; Sander-Staudt, 2011; Tronto, 1993). While the former especially remains an issue this study also grapples with, Gilligan (2011) and later care ethicists countered that only in a system of patriarchy is care associated with femininity. Instead, care constitutes a basic element of every human being's life, across gender and culture (Robinson, 2006). Indeed, Gilligan's empirical research exhibited empirical flaws that were addressed by later research which found that care ethics is not necessarily a feminine morality (Engster, 2007).

Consequently, since the 1990s a 'second generation' of care ethicists has championed the ethics of care as an overlooked alternative to current domestic and global politics (Hankivsky, 2014). Today, the ethics of care primarily rests on the foregrounding of relationships as a moral principle, taking into account the context and particular situation, the blurring between the private and the political, the perception of emotions as moral tools, and the consistent reference of ethical theory to care practices (Engster & Hamington, 2015; Klaver et al., 2014). To utilise the ethics of care in concrete moral issues like RSW, care ethicists specified a number of values associated with good care, out of which the most fundamental and relevant for this research are: attentiveness, responsibility, competence, responsiveness (Tronto, 1993), plurality, communication and solidarity (Tronto, 2013), trust (Held, 2015), recognizing different points of view, empathy and compassion (Sevenhuijsen, 1998), and respect (Engster, 2007).

Since its inception in the 1980s, the ethics of care continues to expand into a variety of fields and disciplines (Klaver et al., 2014). As research on care, which is still often detached from the ethics of care as a theoretical field, engages more and more with questions of migration (Apitzsch & Schmidbaur, 2010; England, 2005; Williams, 2018), the ethics of care has also started to branch out into migration research and transnational care work (Datta et al., 2010; Hernandez, 2011; Mahon & Robinson, 2011; Raghuram, 2016b; Robinson, 2011; Sullivan, 2016; Tronto, 2015; Williams, 2018). Indeed, in his seminal defence of an ethics of

immigration, Joseph Carens (2013) affirmed that migration constitutes an urgent and critical field of philosophic debate that needs to underpin any political action. Particularly relevant in this context, early care ethicists have been criticised for parochialism and obscuring responsibilities towards distant others. However, feminist scholars of international relations have later addressed this gap and demonstrated how care ethics also applies on a global level (Clark Miller, 2010; Hamington, 2018; Held, 2004; Mahon & Robinson, 2011; Raghuram, 2016a; Robinson, 1997; Tronto, 2015; Williams, 2018).

So far, the ethics of care has not been discussed in the area of integration and the reception of refugees, with Scuzzarello's (2015) and Zembylas and Bozalek's (2011) discussion pieces being the only exceptions. However, they remained on a fairly theoretical and abstract level and thus failed to refer back to practices of care, which is a central element of care-ethical theory building (Held, 2015; Klaver et al., 2014). The current research provides this missing element by investigating traces of the ethics of care in RSW. While the implications of the ethics of care have been discussed for a variety of connected fields, such as citizenship (Sevenhuijsen, 1998), international relations (Clark Miller, 2010; Held, 2005; Robinson, 2010), democracy (Tronto, 2013) or postcolonial analyses of power structures (Narayan, 1995), these insights have not been combined so far. Moreover, although some care ethicists refer to feminist scholars of multiculturalism such as Iris Marion Young (Conradi & Heier, 2014; Sevenhuijsen, 2003; Tronto, 2014), this connection has not explicitly been formulated yet. Feminist scholars have found significant flaws with traditional multicultural theory, particularly around the protection of women's interests, more individualised conceptions of group identities and complex power dynamics (Anthias, 2002; Lyshaug, 2004; Okin, 1999; Saharso, 2003).The ethics of care concerns itself with exactly those questions and can therefore provide crucial impulses on how to improve and preserve multiculturalism despite the current attacks. Therefore, as I show in Paper Three, the ethics of care bears much potential for migration and integration studies that has not sufficiently been exhausted yet. This study ventures into this gap by proposing the notion of 'caring integration' and hopes to spark a more extensive debate on care-ethical changes to integration politics. The research project thus advances the political ethics of care along Joan Tronto's lines, who continually broadens her political argumentation on care, recently proposing a 'caring democracy' (Tronto, 2013, 2014). With migration and integration being one of the most hotly debated and controversial topics in today's democracies, analysing them through a care-ethical lens is an indispensable part of a comprehensive theory of care (Engster, 2007).

Papers One and Three in particular champion the ethics of care as an alternative perspective on integration and multiculturalism, that might be better attuned to today's realities of globalisation, increasing migration flows and diversifying societies. Care-ethical politics challenge long-established hierarchies and power structures that arguably have contributed

to today's feelings of social crisis. Being traditionally associated with the feminine sphere and feminist thought, the ethics of care has long been marginalised and not been taken seriously in philosophical and political theory (Tronto, 1993, 2014). This article concurs with acclaimed scholars such as Tronto (2013), Williams (2018) and Robinson (2010) in demanding the consideration of care-ethical strategies in policy fields where traditional approaches have failed to provide a solution. Immigration and integration arguably constitute prime examples of such fields.

As demonstrated in Paper Three, the ethics of care is particularly well suited to accommodate minorities and groups different to mainstream society. That which has been discussed in relation to immigration and refugees here may also be true for other disregarded groups such as children (Cockburn, 2005), the queer community (Cooper, 2007), women of colour (Graham, 2007), disabled people (Hughes, McKie, Hopkins, & Watson, 2005) or transgender communities (Hines, 2007). Conceivably, the ethics of care may even be suitable to address right-wing populism. Perceptions of not being listened to and taken seriously seem to drive a considerable amount of support for populist right-wing parties (Mudde, 2004; Vehrkamp & Wratil, 2017). Paying attention to each individual's perspective when making political decisions forms a crucial part of the ethics of care. It therefore seems possible that in a 'caring democracy', disgruntled members of mainstream society may be heard by politics and therefore less likely to be drawn to extreme parties.

Some scholars have already pointed to the role of civil society in advancing the ethics of care (Held, 2005; Tronto, 2015). More specifically, Porter (2006) explicitly singled out refugee advocacy groups as inspiring examples for this kind of compassionate activism. As a consequence, Robinson (1997, p. 130) concluded that only a global civil society "can work toward the fostering of relationships across political communities, encouraging attentiveness and responsiveness to situations of real need among concrete, rather than abstract, individuals."

Political empowerment through care

Finally, the research taps into feminist literature on political participation and provides a further example of women's political involvement which is often considerably different to men's. Traditionally, the male-biased study of political participation and politics in general has often maintained that women lack political interest and knowledge (Campbell & Winters, 2008; Coffé & Bolzendahl, 2010; Fuchs, 2006). Empirical studies however have shown that structural factors cannot fully explain this 'gender gap' in political participation, pointing towards cultural forces that restrict women to the private and domestic sphere (Coffé, 2013; Sartori, Tuorto, & Ghigi, 2017; Westle, 2001). The construction of politics as a male domain leads to a lack of political efficacy for women which results in less participation, as women do not feel like their voice matters (Conway, Steuernagel, & Ahern, 2005). Moreover, the fields

where women do seem to be more active than men, in particular emerging forms of political participation such as boycotts, petitioning and protesting (Coffé & Bolzendahl, 2010; Stolle & Hooghe, 2011) have largely been excluded in studies of political participation (Ekman & Amnå, 2012). Particularly relevant for this study, Herd and Meyer (2002) maintained that care work also constitutes a form of civic engagement and political participation, as the unpaid care work mainly done by women nurtures democratic citizens and fosters trust and reciprocity. Similarly, RSW has often been framed as a humanitarian matter only and has thus been denied its political character (Fleischmann & Steinhilper, 2017). My research challenges both of these stereotypes by showing, particularly in Papers One and Three, that female volunteers do employ RSW to express their political values and that previous definitions of political participation and 'the political' have to be challenged and extended. Here, it follows care-ethical arguments that question the boundary between public and private which perpetrated women's exclusion from the political arena in the past (Tronto, 1993).

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PAPERS

The PhD project consists of three papers in total which build on each other and are closely interlinked. Each takes up a different aspect of the central research topic, female volunteers in RSW, and connects it to the central research aims introduced above. To provide more detail on the objective of each paper in the context of the research, the following section will expand on the specific research questions of each paper separately.

Paper One (The Anti-Racist Potential of Care):

- What role does gender play in RSW and what are the main differences to male RSW volunteers?
- Why are women drawn to volunteering in this domain in particular?
- What motivates women to take up voluntary work supporting refugees?
- Which values and social belief systems are invoked?

The first paper on the 'Anti-Racist Potential of Care' discusses the result of the quantitative pre-study. In the context of the whole research project, it aims to identify the central themes surrounding the main research questions, particularly motivations to volunteer and the possible influence of gender on voluntary RSW. Concerning the former, the paper establishes that RSW has a political character, particularly for female volunteers, and introduces the ethics of care as a potential analytical frame. Looking at the latter area, potential gender differences, the paper demonstrates that female volunteers do indeed understand their involvement differently to men, and also use it as a tool to express their political opinion.

Paper Two (Same Same But Different):

- In which contexts and situations do feelings and notions of difference occur for female volunteers in RSW?
- Where and how do they construct feelings and notions of sameness?
- How do the dynamics of bonding and boundary construction manifest themselves in the narratives of the participants?

The second paper entitled ‘Same Same But Different’ zooms in to the central research aims and mainly focuses on the first part, the relevance of difference. Drawing on the qualitative fieldwork, it provides an empirical look into the day-to-day relationships with refugees on the ground, as narrated by the female volunteers. The paper investigates the ambivalent practices and attitudes of the volunteers which oscillate between establishing bonds and distancing themselves. In doing so, it analyses the central challenges of difference that the volunteers experience, and will need to be taken up in any search for suitable strategies. A particularly important contribution in the context of the project, especially in connection with Paper Three, consists in the problematisation of certain behaviours and statements in the interviews that reveal the power dynamics in RSW.

Paper Three (Taking Care of the Other):

- How do female volunteers negotiate difference and how do they develop a productive relationship with the refugees?
- Can traces of the ethics of care be found empirically in the qualitative fieldwork? If so, how do they manifest themselves?
- To what extent could the care-ethical approach used by the volunteers be a source of inspiration for integration politics?
- How can practices and policies of integration and multiculturalism be improved?

Finally, Paper Three on ‘Taking Care of the Other’ takes up the second part of the main research aim, the strategies the volunteers employ to overcome experiences of difference and key challenges in their relationship to the refugees. It is thus closely connected to Paper Two, which illustrates experiences of difference, and Paper One, which already found evidence for care orientations in RSW. The third paper now further develops the ethics of care theme as a potential solution to the challenge of difference both in the actual work of the volunteers and in integration politics more broadly. It thus examines how the ethics of care could provide a resolution for the friction between sameness and difference that the second paper sketched out, and how it could be applied to society and politics as well. Paper Three thus closes the circle by taking up the central themes introduced by Paper One and Paper Two and connecting these to fulfil the objective of finding alternative strategies to deal with refugees and migrants in today’s heated political climate.

METHODOLOGY

This PhD project makes use of both qualitative and quantitative research methods, with an emphasis on the former. The quantitative part consisted of two surveys carried out as part of the project "Strukturen und Motive der ehrenamtlichen Flüchtlingsarbeit (EFA) in Deutschland" by Serhat Karakayali and J. Olaf Kleist at the Berliner Institut für empirische Integrations- und Migrationsforschung (BIM), Humboldt Universität zu Berlin (see also Karakayali & Kleist, 2015, 2016). The PhD project however omits the first EFA-study from 2014, as due to the immense changes in RSW in 2015 it is not directly comparable. The first study this project uses was carried out in October and November 2015 and includes a sample of 2,291. The second study took place in December 2016 and January 2017 with 1,286 completions, adding up to a total sample of 3,577. Both studies used the same approach to fieldwork, which consisted in an online survey ca. 20 minutes long targeting volunteers in RSW in Germany. The surveys were sent to the *Flüchtlingsräte* (Councils for Refugees) of the federal German states who forwarded them to volunteers. As umbrella organisations for RSW, the Flüchtlingsräte are able to reach a large number of volunteers that generally represent the field well, which reduced the risk of sample selection bias. Nevertheless, as at the time no representative study to compare the data against and generate quotas existed, complete representativeness could not be ensured. Both studies made use of the same questionnaire, with a small number of amendments for 2016. The approach to data analysis undertaken in this dissertation consisted in standard statistical analysis and binary logistic regression analysis to separate the influence of the category of gender, which was central for the research questions, from other variables. Therefore, apart from gender the regression analysis included the independent variables age, education, employment status, financial situation, religion, migration background and birth in Germany.

The qualitative fieldwork consisted of 22 semi-structured face-to-face interviews with female RSW volunteers. They took place in four different locations in Germany to account for differences between urban and rural areas, and East and West Germany. Interviews took place in Berlin and Hamburg for the urban perspective and in two small towns in Brandenburg and Baden-Württemberg for the rural. I mostly gained access to participants through contacting refugee support organisations where a representative or spokesperson forwarded my request to their volunteers. This data was supplemented by a small number of interviews organised through personal contacts. This sampling method led to a relatively diverse and representative sample of female volunteers. Aged between 20 and 70 years, the participants' occupational background ranged from students to working professionals and pensioners. The organisations they volunteered with also differed in focus and size, with some working at bigger pre-established organisations, but with most being part of small-scale local initiatives, founded in or after 2015. The qualitative fieldwork took place between May and July 2018. While using an interview guide concentrating on motivations, description

of the work and some broader issues like integration, I followed Lofland's (1971) interviewing method of 'guided conversation'. This approach allowed me to remain flexible and adapt the guide depending on the situation, for example skipping or changing the order of questions or concentrating further on relevant topics. To ensure adequate ethical standards, I obtained informed consent both when initially contacting the volunteers and right before the interviews. All names and other identifying information have been omitted in this dissertation to safeguard the anonymity of participants. I digitally recorded and then transcribed all interviews except one. The qualitative content analysis of the data used detailed code frames informed by the respective research questions and theoretical concepts.

Paper One on the 'Anti-Racist Potential of Care' relies exclusively on the quantitative data from the EFA studies. As it was partly designed as an exploratory paper to identify the main themes of the study, quantitative methodology constituted a particularly suitable tool to extract a general direction that could be explored further through qualitative interviews. The quantitative analysis thus laid a firm and substantial basis for the qualitative analysis by providing larger context and validity. It thereby helped uncover structural influences behind individual experiences and broader societal mechanisms at play. Here, it was also possible to test potential differences between male and female volunteers, which would have been hard to do reliably and robustly using qualitative data. Consequently, the following papers delved into the meaning of these differences for female volunteers only and explored the reasons why they placed more importance on certain values and qualities of refugee support work than men. The first paper thus initiated the mix of inductive and deductive analysis that I adopted in this PhD project by using a more grounded theory influenced method that was further expanded on theoretically and empirically afterwards.

By contrast, Paper Two (Same Same but Different) only concentrated on the qualitative dataset. The research questions and theoretical framework here relate to more intricate and individual themes that could not be covered using a rather short and limited standardised questionnaire as common in quantitative surveys. Particularly in trying to discern how research subjects constructed difference, a flexible, in-depth interviewing style allowed me to approach subconscious, hidden, or socially disapproved attitudes and behaviours that they potentially would not have shared outside a personalised interviewing relationship. Moreover, the theory on difference and sameness illustrates the oftentimes complex, even contradictory strategies of reasoning implicated which demand an equally elaborate data collection method. Similarly, social-psychological theory on implicit bias and aversive racism suggests that many of these cognitive processes unfold unconsciously, so a more prompting interviewing method is required.

Finally, Paper Three on 'Taking Care of the Other' made use of both the qualitative and the quantitative dataset, with an emphasis on the former. In particular, it attended to the task of

further delving into the themes identified in Paper One and substantiated them with more in-depth, detailed analysis. It explored what exactly the research subjects mean when agreeing to certain statements in the quantitative study, how they live and shape care-ethical and political values and aimed to grasp potential contradictions inherent in lived experience. However, to underscore the political significance of women's involvement in refugee support work which is often dismissed and overlooked, the paper included some results from the quantitative study that demonstrate this fact more clearly and convincingly. Arguably, this method of triangulation increases the validity and broader applicability of the findings.

PAPER ONE – THE ANTI-RACIST POTENTIAL OF CARE

Political dimensions of women's engagement in voluntary refugee support work in Germany

Published as: Schmid, S. (2019). The anti-racist potential of care - political dimensions of women's engagement in voluntary refugee support work in Germany. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2019.1629886.

Published online: 12 June 2019

Tables directly taken from the published article.

Abstract

This article explores the role of gender in volunteering with refugees in Germany and how female volunteers, who outnumber male volunteers considerably, understand their involvement differently from men. Drawing upon quantitative data from two studies with volunteers in refugee work in Germany from 2015 and 2016, I discuss the motivations of female volunteers to engage in refugee support work, the meaning they give to their experience of working with refugees and the values they wish to demonstrate through their voluntary work. The article centrally maintains that refugee support work can be classed as a form of care work and is informed by an ethics and values of care. However, other results unveil that women interpret their care work as an expression of their political attitudes, specifically about anti-racism and anti right-wing activism, as well, and thereby have recourse to a supposedly male political justification for engaging in volunteering. Thus, this article argues that these two forms of motivation for volunteering, care and politics, do not need to be mutually exclusive. Crucially, voluntary refugee support work represents a unique opportunity for women's political activism for anti-racism and cultural openness.

Introduction

In the summer of 2015, a ‘summer fairy tale’ swept over Germany. After an unexpectedly large number of refugees arrived in the country, thousands of Germans flocked to train stations and emergency shelters to offer help in a possibly unprecedented wave of empathy with refugees. However, the autumnal disillusionment was not long in coming. Xenophobic populism and growing unease with Germany’s extraordinary willingness to receive refugees soon started to creep into the public discourse. Eventually, the anti-refugee discourse led to the entry of the right-wing populist party Alternative for Germany (AfD) into the German parliament – a first for Germany since the Second World War.

Women have played a unique role in this debate. Making up the vast majority of volunteers in refugee support work (Karakayali & Kleist, 2015, 2016), they are particularly visible as defenders of a new politics of welcome. This plays against traditional gender stereotypes that restrict women to the unpolitical, private sphere (Coffé & Bolzendahl, 2010). Hence, the gendered nature of the discourse on refugees, as exemplified in volunteering, emerges as a crucial, interesting new field of current fault lines in gender relations.

Academic research is only slowly beginning to turn its attention towards the impact of the refugee movement on German politics and society. This article contributes to closing the gap in the understanding of these recent developments by investigating the role voluntary work with refugees plays for women as political and social actors. It starts by conceptualising refugee support work as care work that is underpinned by a feminist ethics of care. I will demonstrate that the gendered character of refugee support work not only stems from a significant over-representation of female volunteers, but is also inherent in the volunteers’ values and the work itself (see Wuthnow, 1995). Accordingly, my first hypothesis assumes that volunteering with refugees constitutes an example of traditionally female care work guided by values of care and compassion.

However, due to the intensely contentious nature of the refugee debate, the commitment to helping its primary targets inevitably implies political positioning. Therefore, my second hypothesis adds to the care approach by demonstrating that voluntary work with refugees also carries political dimensions. This hypothesis follows the claims of feminist political scientists (Coffé, 2013; Stolle & Hooghe, 2011) who maintain that the study of political participation has long overlooked women’s political concerns and forms of activism. I argue that refugee support work constitutes one of these neglected forms of activism, as both the subject matter – a local and social issue – and the form of activism – civil engagement – is traditionally dismissed as a non-political female occupation.

To test these hypotheses, this article seeks to uncover why women dominate voluntary work with refugees to such a large extent and explores the motives and aims of female volunteers. It analyses the values and belief systems they invoke using statistical and binary logistic regression analyses of two quantitative surveys with volunteers in refugee support work in Germany from 2015 and 2016. The empirical results from these studies support both hypotheses. The majority of common activities in refugee support work fall under the definition of care work, and main motivations link to care values specified by care ethics as well. Among other indications, the vast over-representation of female volunteers suggests that women are more likely to be drawn to this form of care work. Strikingly, however, two motivations focusing on political aims of volunteering are overwhelmingly more likely to be supported by female volunteers. This finding shows that through volunteering, women act on their political values of tolerance and diversity.

To begin with, I will expand on the theoretical background of care theories and women's political participation. This section also demonstrates how care and politics have traditionally been gendered in volunteerism research. A methodological overview provides further detail on the two quantitative studies used, and describes the approach to data analysis. The next section presents the empirical results of the quantitative analysis in more detail. Finally, the discussion relates the empirical findings to my hypotheses and academic literature, finishing off with a concluding summary.

Literature review

Gendered patterns in volunteering

While there is a controversial debate on the definition of volunteering (Hustinx, Cnaan, & Handy, 2010), this study relies on the interpretation by Susan J. Ellis and Katherine H. Noyes (1990, p. 4) who state that 'to volunteer is to choose to act in recognition of a need, with an attitude of social responsibility and without concern for monetary profit, going beyond one's basic obligations.' Much of the research on volunteering originated in the United States and rests on the assumption that women are more likely to volunteer than men (Wilson, 2012). However, in their exhaustive meta-review across a number of different countries, contexts and empirical studies, Robert Musick and John Wilson (2008) found no clear direction of whether women or men are more likely to volunteer. In general, gender differences tend to be quite small and can vary across domain or country (Einolf, 2011). In Germany, the Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth regularly carries out a Freiwilligensurvey (German Survey on Volunteering) and found that German women generally volunteer less than men (Simonson, Vogel, & Tesch-Römer, 2017). Consistent with findings from other countries, women's level of engagement varies across domains of

volunteering. They volunteer most in the areas of care, e.g. youth and child care, while men dominate in most other areas (Vogel, Simonson, Ziegelmann, & Tesch-Römer, 2017).

In the study of volunteering, these gender differences have been investigated from various angles. Structural approaches address differential access to resources such as education, social capital or employment which generally inhibit women's likelihood to volunteer (Einolf, 2011; Gerstel, 2000), while others, for example church membership or motherhood, encourage volunteering among women (Musick & Wilson, 2008). However, quantitative analyses show that sociodemographic characteristics often cannot fully account for gender differences in volunteering (Dekker & Halman, 2003), turning the attention towards potential motivational differences between men and women. The study on gender differences in motivations to volunteers has been equally varied and contested. Originating in social psychology, the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) predominates in volunteerism research (Clary et al., 1998). In the VFI, women tend to rate all factors higher, which suggests that they possess a stronger motivation to volunteer in general (Einolf, 2011). Other psychological research found that women seem to be more prosocial, compassionate and more likely to feel responsibility and moral obligation towards others (Einolf, 2011; Musick & Wilson, 2008). Crucially, however, social theory argues that these psychological differences are socially constructed and stem from culture and childhood socialisation (Gerstel, 2000). Consequently, studies on female volunteering have devoted considerable attention to the influence of the social context and cultural beliefs on motivations to volunteer. Cultural analyses conceptualise volunteering as a means to express basic human values (Hustinx et al., 2010), choosing from an internalised repertoire of cultural norms available at a certain place and time. Values and culture hence have a strong influence on the configuration of voluntary work, particularly on choosing the domain of volunteering (Musick & Wilson, 2008).

A female ethic of care

As a starting point, Robert Wuthnow (1991) demonstrated that the values of compassion and care are strongly associated with volunteering. Therefore, feminist discussions of care prove particularly insightful to investigate the cultural context that influences women to attach more value to helping and caring for others than men (Einolf, 2011; Themudo, 2009). Care work is most commonly understood as relational action, often face-to-face, directed at a person or group that results from recognising and then assuming responsibility for a need for caring (Rummery & Fine, 2012; Tronto, 1998). When deconstructing cultural values of care work further, emotional connection, relationality and feelings of responsibility for needs of others emerge as basic elements (Duffy, 2005). Considering Ellis and Noyes' (1990, p. 4) definition of volunteering cited above, acting 'in recognition of a need' centrally defines volunteering as well. Thus, I concur with Pamela Herd and Madonna Harrington Meyer (2002) that volunteering also constitutes a form of care work.

Traditional gender norms have constructed care as a female domain that rests on women's intrinsic motivation and concern about the well-being of others (Folbre, 2012). Thus, feminist theory has preoccupied itself intensely with the antecedents, ethics and social consequences of care. Most famously, Carol Gilligan (1982) formulated the concept of an 'ethics of care' that supposedly characterises women's moral reasoning and distinct 'different voice' in ethical matters. She argued that from childhood on, girls are socialised to focus on responsibility, relationships, compassion and the needs of others. In contrast, boys acquire an 'ethics of justice' that concentrates on personal autonomy, rationality, abstraction and hierarchy. In subsequent years, empirical studies criticised Gilligan's theory for methodological flaws, questionable replicability, using sex categories rather than gender role identity and most importantly, sustaining traditional binary gender stereotypes (Skoe, Cumberland, Eisenberg, Hansen, & Perry, 2002). Nevertheless, the ethics of care have sparked a lively debate that gained traction in various fields ranging from disability studies to political science and law (Duffy, 2005; Rummery & Fine, 2012). Consequently, care ethics have also profoundly influenced volunteerism research. The above-cited research on women's more prosocial volunteering motivations directly links to discussions of care values, as Robert Wuthnow (1995) convincingly demonstrated in his study on young people's gendered understandings of volunteering.

Considering women's remarkable over-representation in voluntary work with refugees, I propose that refugee support work can be interpreted as an expression of care. Volunteering practices often entail close relationships, for example when providing direct, practical support with everyday life, and they presume a great amount of empathy, particularly when volunteering with cultural others. Therefore, the first hypothesis this paper will test states that women are drawn to volunteering with refugees because it speaks to values of care and compassion, which are constructed as inherently female.

Political dimensions of volunteering with refugees

Politics was long constructed as a male domain, which potentially explains women's lower involvement in traditional political activities and their lower political interest and knowledge (Inglehart & Norris, 2003). However, reacting to the ongoing decline of traditional forms of political participation, political science has increasingly turned to the study of less conventional forms of participation. For instance, Joakim Ekman and Erik Amnå (2012) argued that extra-parliamentary, latent and informal activities such as civic engagement should be acknowledged as forms of political participation and expressing political values. Moreover, René Bekkers (2005) showed that political values and attitudes are strongly correlated with voluntary work and suggested that political interest might affect the likelihood to volunteer positively. Crucially here, Herd and Meyer (2002) convincingly contend that voluntary care work should also be included into definitions of civic engagement. Tatjana

Thelen (2015) even goes one step further suggesting that care is fundamental for processes of political belonging in the public sphere.

Strikingly, in these newer forms of political participation, the so-called gender gap in political participation is challenged, sometimes even reversing itself (Stolle & Hooghe, 2011). Women seem to prefer private activism or smaller-scale forms of participation that fit more easily into their private lives (Sartori, Tuorto, & Ghigi, 2017). What is more, feminist political scientists have also challenged the meaning of the 'political' in the wake of second-wave feminism. When 'politics' is understood in traditional gender biased terms of national and institutional contexts, female concerns centred on local and community issues remain neglected (Coffé, 2013). Only a broader recognition of 'politics' also encompassing social issues and local policy levels brings to light women's political engagement as well.

I thus argue that while men and women both possess political values, they tend to act on them differently. Voluntary support for refugees serves as a paradigmatic tool for female political participation. While first appearing as a humanitarian matter of caring for and integrating newcomers, refugee support work arguably connects to a highly politicised discourse as well (Vollmer & Karakayali, 2017). The debate on refugees has dominated the German public discourse since the summer of 2015 and was a key topic in the federal elections of 2017. While on the one hand, the public celebrated the outstanding support and many Germans' readiness to volunteer for refugees, on the other hand, growing xenophobic right-wing sentiment culminated in the entry of the populist anti-immigrant party Alternative for Germany (AfD) into the German parliament. In such a polarised discourse, the commitment to volunteering with refugees inevitably implies taking a side in the debate and therefore sends a clear political signal. Indeed, Lorenzo Zamponi (2017) argued that acting in solidarity with refugees is closely connected to political action, be it through direct political claim-making or as a starting point for further politicisation. Moreover, volunteering might be an especially 'female-friendly' way of taking a stand against racism, as it combines political aims with care acts. Lesley McMillan (2004) already demonstrated that in Australia, feminist forms of activism like refugee and rape crisis centres serve a dual function of both providing care and campaigning for political change. In consequence, my second hypothesis states that volunteering with refugees has political dimensions as well. It functions as a way to oppose right-wing extremism and racism, and to campaign for an open, tolerant culture (Hamann & Karakayali, 2016). Thus, political and non-political motivations are not mutually exclusive and contribute to the meaning of voluntary work to a similar extent.

Hypotheses

(1) Refugee support work constitutes a form of care work that is deeply gendered.

(2) Women's participation in refugee support work also serves political functions of anti-racism.

Methods

This article is based on quantitative data from two studies on voluntary refugee support work in Germany led by Olaf J. Kleist and Serhat Karakayali from the Berlin Institute for Empirical Integration and Migration Research. While three studies have been conducted in total, of which the main results of the first two have already been published (Karakayali & Kleist, 2015, 2016), this study only concentrates on the second and third wave executed in 2015 and 2016, and omits the first study of 2014. The fieldwork for the 2014 study was carried out before the rupture in refugee support work in the summer of 2015, when an unprecedented number of refugees changed the organisation of refugee support work considerably (Karakayali & Kleist, 2016). Hence, the findings of this first study are not directly comparable to the other two, as the fieldwork took place under vastly different circumstances.

For both studies, an online survey was emailed to the Flüchtlingsräte (Councils for Refugees) of the federal German states with the request to forward it to volunteers. The Flüchtlingsräte are umbrella organisations for refugee support work connecting most organisations and initiatives in each federal state, therefore they generally represent the field of German refugee support work well. They are able to reach a large number of diverse volunteers, resulting in limited sample selection bias. However, a representative framework to compare this study's sample composition against does not exist and it was not possible to weigh the data accordingly. The nation-wide German Freiwilligensurvey (German Survey on Volunteering) has last been carried out in 2014, before the changes of 2015, and is only due to be repeated in 2019, so it did not yet include the sub-field of refugee support work. Consequently, the representativeness of the sample could not be ensured completely and due caution should be exercised when interpreting the data. After the publication of the next wave of the Freiwilligensurvey, the analysis could be re-run weighted on this study's sample composition of volunteers in refugee support work.

In 2015, 2,291 active or former volunteers in Germany aged 16 or above completed the survey between 22 October and 23 November. It was about 20 minutes long and covered multiple topic areas including the nature of the voluntary work; organisational circumstances; reasons and motivations to volunteer; the experience of volunteering; attitudes on media discourses or political issues; and aims and rewards of volunteering. Serhat Karakayali and Olaf J. Kleist (2016) published the main results in an overview report. The third wave of the study ran between 7 December 2016 and 8 January 2017 using the same research method and sample as before, resulting in 1,286 completions. The survey used an only slightly adapted version of the 2015 questionnaire and is thus directly comparable to the data from

2015. Out of the items tested below, only one question aiming at the function of volunteering changed, from ‘to show that, besides right-wing populism and violence, a culture of welcome also exists’ to ‘to act against right-wing mobilisation in my city/neighbourhood’. The researchers wanted to avoid the term ‘welcome culture’, which volunteers increasingly criticised. However, the results remained highly statistically significant, suggesting that the question was interpreted similarly across both waves of the study. The main results of the 2016 wave have not been published yet.

The definition of categories represents a critical point of any analysis by gender. For the question ‘What is your gender’, the survey provided three answer options: male, female, other. For the purpose of data analysis by gender, the ‘other’ option (n(2015) = 22, n(2016) = 11) was removed and only the categories male and female fed into the statistical models. As the sample numbers were too low to make any statistically meaningful comparisons, this paper is reproducing the binary gender system that the ethics of care is generally based on as well (Hankivsky, 2014). The omission of this category from the research findings means that unavoidably, some perspectives will be missing that could potentially produce interesting challenges to the interpretation of the findings as a political ethics of care. Indeed, Hines (2007) questioned and extended the research on care by explicitly looking at transgender caring practices which stress agency, shared experience and distinct identity positions. Similarly, while research on non-binary refugees is sparse, studies of sexual minority refugees shows that their support needs differ considerably, for example the need for a sense of belonging to queer racialised communities in order to resist intersecting racism and sexism or for specialised knowledge to assert credibility during asylum hearings (Lee & Brotman, 2011; Murray, 2011). Relating a queer ethics of care to these refugee spaces may greatly expand the scope of this article’s argument for a political care orientation in refugee support work. Therefore, it would be valuable to do a fully inclusive analysis with those who do not identify as gender-binary in the future, for example with a survey specifically targeting queer activists, a survey with a larger sample size that would then also include a larger number of those identifying as non-binary or a qualitative analysis of queer refugee support work.

Looking at the sample by gender, it is important to note that the age profile of male and female volunteers differs remarkably. In 2015, 45% and in 2016, 61% of male volunteers were aged 60 or over. In contrast, only 20% (2015) and 35% (2016) of female volunteers belonged to this age category. This strong age difference mediates a number of variables, for example employment status.

Apart from standard statistical analysis, I employed binary logistic regression analyses of some variables to separate the effect of age from gender. The questions all used Likert scales with 4- or 5-point scales. The data analysis combined the two top scores (agree

strongly and agree) to obtain stronger validity in the findings. Gender, age, education, employment status, financial situation, religion, migration background and birth in Germany fed into the regression as independent variables. While the first six variables commonly show strong correlations with likelihood to volunteer (Musick & Wilson, 2008), migration background and birth in Germany were added to account for any effects of former experience of migration on helping current newcomers.

Results

The following data analysis combines the data of 2015 and 2016, as separately, both years show similar results and a larger sample number potentially yields more robust findings. The tables for the binary logistic regression analyses display values for the eight independent variables described above with a main focus on gender. Asterisks indicate a high significance level of p-values.

Refugee support work as care work

To demonstrate that refugee support work can be classified as care work, this section first examines the actual constitution of the everyday work. The table below details the five most common activities that volunteers specified in the surveys (Table 1).

Table 1. Main activities.

Activity	Total % of volunteers engaging in this activity
Language classes	46%
Visit to the authorities	45%
Other practical help	41%
Support of other volunteers	41%
Relationship to the local community	32%
N	3577

All of the above tasks involve direct, face-to-face relationships with other people, with the exception of 'other practical help' which remains ambiguous. Furthermore, most of the tasks, potentially with the exception of relationships to the local community, are directed towards clearly identifiable needs the recipients cannot satisfy themselves such as learning the German language or dealing with German bureaucracy and law. As demonstrated above, relationality is the most defining feature of the definition of care (Duffy, 2005), and recognizing and addressing specific needs is an inherent part of the caring activity (Tronto, 1998).

To test motivations relating to care ethics, the analysis examined responses to the question 'Why did you decide to volunteer in refugee support work?'. The table below details the percentage of those stating the relevant item 'applies' or 'rather applies' (Table 2).

Table 2. Main motivations.

	Total % of 'applies'/'rather applies'
Because I generally believe that you have to care for disadvantaged people.	86%
Because I am generally interested in people from different cultures.	69%
Because I can understand very well how people are feeling that are fleeing from war.	67%
Because they were on site and someone had to take care of them.	59%
Because through media reports, I learned how difficult it is for those people in Germany.	47%
In my social environment it is generally considered important to support refugees and other socially disadvantaged groups.	42%
Close relatives or friends inspired me.	16%
Because I wanted to volunteer and there were not many other offers.	11%
N	3577

As becomes clear, the main motivation to volunteer with refugees springs from a firm conviction that caring for those in need comprises an essential moral obligation. This explicitly ties in with central elements of care work and ethics, such as the recognition and assumption of responsibility for people exhibiting need (Tronto, 1998).

Having demonstrated that refugee support work constitutes a form of care work, I now aim to establish its gendered character. Remarkably, women are significantly over-represented among the participants. In 2015, they constituted 76% and in 2016, they made up 70% of the total sample. Interestingly, women are particularly over-represented in the younger age group of volunteers under 60 years old (2015: 82%; 2016: 79% of those under 60). Contrasting common assumptions in volunteerism research that middle-aged women tend to volunteer less because of the time-constraints resulting from child-rearing and work (Musick & Wilson, 2008), refugee support work seems to be so attractive to women that it even surmounts these structural barriers. Thus, women in particular are drawn to voluntary refugee support work, as to care work generally (Karakayali & Kleist, 2016).

Moreover, a binary regression analysis of the answer 'The feeling of not having idly watched the suffering of others' to a question about the rewards of volunteering reveals that female volunteers are more likely to agree with this statement ($p = 0.019$), as well as older volunteers. Again, this finding connects to a moral obligation to help and care once the need for caring is recognised, which is a main element of Tronto's (1998) model of care work. In conclusion, the above data supports the first hypothesis that refugee support work is a form of care work that is gendered and attracts women more than men (Table 3).

Table 3. Net agreement to 'The feeling of not having idly watched the suffering of others' (strongly agree (1) and agree (2)).

	B-Coefficient	Standard error	p value significance
Gender	−0.272	0.116	0.019*
Age	0.009	0.003	0.008**
Education	0.104	0.105	0.322
Employment	−0.078	0.106	0.460
Migration background	0.144	0.107	0.177
Financial situation	−0.011	0.107	0.920
Religion	0.130	0.103	0.206
Born in Germany	−0.220	0.204	0.280
Constant	1.197	0.210	0.000
R2 (Cox & Snell)	0.005		
N	3142		
Means	Male: 4.226	Female: 4.372	

Significance: *p ≤ 0.05, **p ≤ 0.01, ***p ≤ 0.000

Political dimensions of refugee support work

To test the second hypothesis, the influence of political motives on women's understanding of refugee support work, I investigated answer codes to a question on the goals of volunteering, 'Do you agree fully, partly or not at all to the following statements about your voluntary work? Through volunteering, I want to . . . '. Two of the answer codes to this question show significant differences by gender: 'Take a stand against racism', and 'Show that, besides right-wing populism and violence, a culture of welcome also exists'/'acting against right-wing mobilisation in my city/neighbourhood' (code slightly adapted for the 2016 wave).

The first answer code 'Take a stand against racism' shows a very high significance by gender (p = 0.000), with women being more likely to agree than men. The only other significant variable that influences the likelihood to agree is having a migration background. Those with an own or family experience of migration are less likely to agree that they want to take a stand against racism (Table 4).

Table 4. Net agreement to 'Take a stand against racism' (strongly agree (1) and agree (2)).

	B-Coefficient	Standard error	p value significance
Gender	−1.226	0.188	0.000***
Age	−0.003	0.006	0.693
Education	0.075	0.191	0.695
Employment	0.061	0.196	0.756
Migration background	0.549	0.188	0.004**
Financial situation	0.171	0.197	0.387
Religion	0.355	0.188	0.059
Born in Germany	−0.252	0.340	0.460
Constant	3.162	0.396	0.000
R2 (Cox & Snell)	0.018		
N	3164		
Means	Male: 1.366	Female: 1.193	

Significance: *p ≤ 0.05, **p ≤ 0.01, ***p ≤ 0.001

The other statistically notable answer code 'Welcome culture/against right-wing mobilisation' is highly significant by gender as well, with women being more likely to agree by a p-value of p = 0.000. Similar to the above finding, those who were not born in Germany are less likely to agree with this answer as well.

Notably, other variables that were highly statistically significant for gender related to an interest in a different culture. For example, a logistic regression analysis of the volunteering reward 'Insight into different cultures' delivers a p-value of p = 0.000 for women being more likely to agree. A similar result can be observed regarding women's agreement to other items relating to culture. Consequently, women seem to value the cultural difference and diversity they experience in refugee support work more, which potentially informs and motivates their aim to act against racism and for a 'welcome culture' (Table 5).

Table 5. Net agreement to 'Insight into different cultures' (strongly agree (4) and agree (3)).

	B-Coefficient	Standard error	p value significance
Gender	−0.568	0.094	0.000***
Age	0.001	0.003	0.612
Education	−0.087	0.087	0.319
Employment	−0.080	0.089	0.369
Migration background	−0.123	0.092	0.179
Financial situation	0.015	0.089	0.868
Religion	−0.032	0.085	0.706
Born in Germany	−0.575	0.168	0.001**
Constant			
R2 (Cox & Snell)	0.016		
N	3108		
Means	Male: 3.808	Female: 4.164	

Significance: *p ≤ 0.05, **p ≤ 0.01, ***p ≤ 0.000

Discussion

Taken together, the empirical results support both hypotheses of this study. An analysis of the main tasks and motivations in refugee support work demonstrates that the activity constitutes a form of care work. The large over-representation of women among volunteers confirms that women are more drawn to care work in the case of refugee support as well. Notwithstanding, for women, the meaning of voluntary work with refugees evidently has political dimensions, as they were significantly more likely to agree with some political aims than men. Female volunteers employ volunteering as a tool to speak up against racism and right-wing hostility against immigrants. This relates to another motivation to get involved in volunteering with refugees, an interest in foreign cultures. Once again, this study showed that women's interests and actions are not only restricted to an unpolitical domestic sphere. Instead, they use different, more unconventional means of political expression and participation that better fit to their everyday lives but conform to still prevailing cultural norms of acceptable forms of public activism for women (Sartori et al., 2017).

This finding profoundly resonates with the fundamental feminist credo that ‘the personal is political’. Volunteering with refugees similarly transcends the female-coded, private realm of care and enters the public sphere of anti-racist politics. After the summer of 2015, few other topics were as present in the public and political discourse in Germany and worldwide than immigration and refugees, which is why it is remarkable that especially women position themselves so clearly in the debate and thereby defy the stereotype of women shying away from political conflict (Coffé & Bolzendahl, 2010). Particularly, young feminist activists and scholars increasingly point out the continuities between feminism and anti-racism. Specifically, they react to a new right-wing discursive strategy that co-opts feminism for racist claims in what Sara R. Farris (2017) termed ‘femonationalism’. In Germany, this debate largely revolves around the events at Cologne during New Year’s Eve 2016, when groups of men of North-African or Arab descent supposedly attacked and sexually assaulted women. Afterwards, right-wing populists proclaimed themselves feminists to protect German women from male migrants constructed as hyper-sexual misogynists. As Stefanie C. Boulila and Christiane Carri (2017, p. 292) pointed out, the discourse around Cologne exemplifies the intersectional interplay between anti-feminism and racism, as ‘Cologne has proven anti-racist feminism as the only political discourse that dismantles the intertwined logics of post-feminist “common-sense” scripts and racialised configurations.’ German women’s voluntary work with refugees thus constitutes one manifestation of this relation between anti-racist and feminist activism.

Above all, the interrelation of acts and actualisations of care and anti-racist political expression opens up the debate on whether care values enable a more constructive negotiation of difference. Remarkably, women are more open towards other cultures than men in the present study, and the political demand they champion through their voluntary work takes the form of a call for an open, tolerant and welcoming society. Might these female volunteers demonstrate an innovative, more suitable politics of accepting and integrating migrants, informed by a sense of empathy and interest in different cultures?

Indeed, when revisiting her work, Carol Gilligan (2011) herself pointed to the transformative potential of an ethics of care for the politics of resistance. She asserted that the feminine ethics of care becomes a human ethic once it is understood in a democratic framework free of patriarchal constraints. Ultimately, she demonstrated, cooperation, interdependence and understanding are inherently human traits. A recent generation of scholars followed Gilligan’s lead and expanded the concept of the ethics of care to a global scale, aspiring to develop ‘a new political theory that can usefully guide analysis and action under contemporary conditions [. . .] [in an] increasingly interrelated and networked society’ (Engster & Hamington, 2015, p. 7). In this perspective, care-informed global ethics can better grasp today’s hybrid, emotive transnational everyday practices and cosmopolitan encounters

(Nava, 2002), which the findings of this study support. Conceivably, relying on care values such as empathy, listening, inclusion and bonding, female volunteers may better recognise the 'other' represented by refugees. In combination with political activism, they could then establish an alternative path to global unity that challenges existing political hierarchies and is better equipped to deal with today's conditions of increased globalisation, dynamics of migration and societal diversification. Certainly, as Carol Gilligan (2011) reminded us, the reality of global interconnectedness and interdependence is impossible to deny today, rendering the ethic of care more relevant and necessary than ever before. Therefore, Virginia Held (2014) suggested that we need a radical transformation of politics, society, the economy, the legal system and the personal sphere towards a 'world of caring' that ensures peaceful coexistence around the globe.

However, it is important to note that in care work, and particularly in refugee support work, considerable power differentials between care-giver and care-receiver complicate their relationship further. Critical care theorists such as Lynch (2015), Narayan (1995) or Williams (2001) pointed out the danger of paternalism and disregard of the actual needs of the care-recipients in their 'best interest' that disrupt trust and the efficiency of care, and can promote social injustice and domination. As various studies have shown, paternalistic dynamics do frequently unfold in German refugee support work (Braun, 2017; Omwenyeke, 2016). On a theoretical level, this is exacerbated by care ethics' origin and firm localisation in the Global North, often rendering dissenting or alternative voices invisible (Graham, 2007; Raghuram, 2016). Indeed, the field of disability studies fiercely attacked the ethics of care for neglecting the views of care-receivers while over-researching and over-emphasizing those of care-givers, a tendency this article consolidates as well (Lloyd, 2000). Moreover, according to disability scholars this perspective tends to keep care-recipients in a state of dependency meaning they possess little autonomy or power themselves (Hughes, McKie, Hopkins, & Watson, 2005) Thus, despite the celebration of the ethics of care as a political alternative, it remains an increasingly contested concept particularly from a postcolonial and disability studies point of view.

Similarly, there are a number of other limitations and opportunities for further research resulting from these findings. As mentioned above, the Germany-wide Freiwilligensurvey is due to be carried out again in 2019. Relating it to the current study would enable an analysis of demographic and socio-economic differences between volunteers generally and volunteers working with refugees, potentially offering a structural explanation to women's over-representation in refugee support work. An intersectional analysis of the profile of female volunteers in refugee support work could also help determine who is still excluded from voluntary work, and why. Additionally, other comparative studies could relate these findings to the larger societal context, for example contrasting them with women who are not

volunteering. This would help determine in more detail whether the results can be generalised any further. Furthermore, it might be interesting to put the study into context with women holding right-wing attitudes, as research found that women in Germany are as or even more racist than men (Zick, Küpper, & Krause, 2016). Considering that the openness to other cultures does not necessarily apply to all German women opens up the question of how care work may be politicised, or not, in a right-wing political context.

Finally, it is important to recognise the discursive construction of the value statements this quantitative study relies upon. Any seemingly 'objective' motive is only meaningful in the particular context it was articulated in and essentially remains dynamic and particular (Musick & Wilson, 2008). Motives mostly operate unconsciously through internalised cultural codes and sometimes might be out of reach for conscious rationalisations in quantitative surveys. Therefore, a deeper qualitative exploration might gain more insight into the actual construction of values of care or anti-racism and uncover their purpose for the construction of the volunteers' self, a perspective still missing in this article. Moreover, it could analyse the reasons why female volunteers are particularly attracted to different cultures, how they understand 'culture' and its relation to the research subjects' identities as both women and volunteers.

Conclusion

Proceeding from the question of why women disproportionally volunteer in refugee support work, this article demonstrated that women's motivations both encompass care values and political aims. The political dimension manifests in the employment of voluntary activity as a signal against racism and right-wing populism. A binary logistic regression analysis of two waves of a quantitative study on German volunteers in refugee support work found that women are more likely to agree that their voluntary work aims at taking a stand against racism and campaigning against right-wing mobilisation or for a welcome culture. They also display a higher interest in other cultures. Consequently, the article argued that refugee support work not only symbolises a variant of care work in the private sphere that is typically attributed to women, but should also be recognised as a political expression of values of openness and anti-racism. Therefore, it represents a form of political activism as well. Voluntary refugee support might be especially attractive for women not only because it speaks to a care orientation, but because it serves as a platform for their political demands as well.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Serhat Karakayali and Olaf J. Kleist from the Berlin Institute on Integration and Migration Research for granting me permission to use the data of their two studies on voluntary refugee support work in Germany.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

References

Bekkers, R. (2005). Participation in voluntary associations: Relations with resources, personality, and political values. *Political Psychology*, 26, 439–454.

Boulila, S. C., & Carri, C. (2017). On Cologne: Gender, migration and unacknowledged racisms in Germany. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 24, 286–293.

Braun, K. (2017). Decolonial perspectives on charitable spaces of "Welcome culture" in Germany. *Social Inclusion*, 5(3), 38–48.

Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Copeland, J., Stukas, A. A., Haugen, J., & Peter, M. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1516–1530.

Coffé, H. (2013). Women stay local, men go national and global? Gender differences in political interest. *Sex Roles*, 69, 323–338.

Coffé, H., & Bolzendahl, C. (2010). Same game, different rules? Gender differences in political participation. *Sex Roles*, 62, 318–333.

Dekker, P., & Halman, L. (2003). Volunteering and values. An introduction. In P. Dekker & L. Halman (Eds.), *The values of volunteering: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 1–17). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Duffy, M. (2005). Reproducing labor inequalities: Challenges for feminists. conceptualizing care at the intersections of gender, race, and class. *Gender & Society*, 19, 66–82.

Einolf, C. J. (2011). Gender differences in the correlates of volunteering and charitable giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40, 1092–1112.

Ekman, J., & Amnå, E. (2012). Political participation and civic engagement: Towards a new typology. *Human Affairs*, 22, 283–300.

Ellis, S. J., & Noyes, K. (1990). *By the people: A history of Americans as volunteers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Engster, D., & Hamington, M. (2015). Introduction. In D. Engster & M. Hamington (Eds.), *Care ethics and political theory* (pp. 1–15). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Farris, S. R. (2017). *In the name of women's rights: The rise of femonationalism*. Durham, London: Duke University Press.

Folbre, N. (2012). Should women care less? Intrinsic motivation and gender inequality. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 50, 597–619.

Gerstel, N. (2000). The third shift: Gender and care work outside the home. *Qualitative Sociology*, 23, 467–483.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, Mass., London: Harvard University Press.

Gilligan, C. (2011). *Joining the resistance*. Cambridge: Polity.

Graham, M. (2007). The ethics of care, black women and the social professions: Implications of a new analysis. *Ethics and Social Welfare*, 1(2), 194–206.

Hamann, U., & Karakayali, S. (2016). Practicing Willkommenskultur: Migration and solidarity in Germany. *Intersections. East European Journal of Society and Politics*, 2, 69–86.

Hankivsky, O. (2014). Rethinking care ethics: On the promise and potential of an intersectional analysis. *American Political Science Review*, 108(2), 252–264.

Held, V. (2014). The ethics of care as normative guidance: Comment on Gilligan. *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 45, 107–115.

Herd, P., & Meyer, M. H. (2002). Care work: Invisible civic engagement. *Gender & Society*, 16, 665–688.

Hines, S. (2007). Transgendering care: Practices of care within transgender communities. *Critical Social Policy*, 27(4), 462–486.

Hughes, B., McKie, L., Hopkins, D., & Watson, N. (2005). Love's labours lost? Feminism, the disabled people's movement and an ethic of care. *Sociology*, 39(2), 259–275.

Hustinx, L., Cnaan, R. A., & Handy, F. (2010). Navigating theories of volunteering: A hybrid map for a complex phenomenon. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 40, 410–434.

Inglehart, R., & Norris, P. (2003). *Rising tide: Gender equality and cultural change around the world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Karakayali, S., & Kleist, J. O. (2015). *Strukturen und Motive der ehrenamtlichen Flüchtlingsarbeit (EFA) in Deutschland, 1. Forschungsbericht. Ergebnisse einer explorativen Umfrage vom November/Dezember 2014*. Berlin: Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin.

Karakayali, S., & Kleist, J. O. (2016). *Strukturen und Motive der ehrenamtlichen Flüchtlingsarbeit (EFA) in Deutschland, 2. Forschungsbericht. Ergebnisse einer explorativen Umfrage vom November/Dezember 2015*. Berlin: Humboldt-Universit ät zu Berlin.

Lee, E. O. J., & Brotman, S. (2011). Identity, refugeeness, belonging: Experiences of sexual minority refugees in Canada. *Canadian Review of Sociology*, 48(3), 241–274.

Lloyd, L. (2000). Caring about carers: Only half the picture? *Critical Social Policy*, 20(1), 136–150.

Lynch, R. (2015). Paternalistic care? In T. Schramme (Ed.), *New perspectives on paternalism and health care* (pp.115–125). New York: Springer.

McMillan, L. (2004). "It's about care as much as it's about feminism": Women's personal and political motivations for volunteering in refuges and rape crisis centres. *Atlantis*, 28, 126–137.

Murray, D. A. B. (2011). Becoming queer here: Integration and adaptation experiences of sexual minority refugees in Toronto. *Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees*, 28(2), 127–135.

Musick, M., & Wilson, J. (2008). *Volunteers: A social profile*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Narayan, U. (1995). Colonialism and its others: Considerations on rights and care discourses. *Hypatia*, 10(2), 133–140.

Nava, M. (2002). Cosmopolitan modernity everyday imaginaries and the register of difference. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 19, 81–99.

Omwenyeke, S. (2016). Solidarität, kein Paternalismus. In D. Weber (Ed.), *Forum Migration Mai 2016* (pp. 5). Düsseldorf: DGB Bildungswerk BUND e.V.

Raghuram, P. (2016). Locating care ethics beyond the global north. *ACME: an International Journal for Critical Geographies*, 15(3), 511–533.

Rummery, K., & Fine, M. (2012). Care: A critical review of theory, policy and practice. *Social Policy & Administration*, 46, 321–343.

Sartori, L., Tuorto, D., & Ghigi, R. (2017). The social roots of the gender gap in political participation: The role of situational and cultural constraints in Italy. *Social Politics*, 24, 221–247.

Simonson, J., Vogel, C., & Tesch-Römer, C. (2017*). Volunteering in Germany: Key findings of the fourth German survey on volunteering*. Berlin: Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth.

Skoe, E. E. A., Cumberland, A., Eisenberg, N., Hansen, K., & Perry, J. (2002). The influences of sex and gender-role identity on moral cognition and prosocial personality traits. *Sex Roles*, 46, 295–309.

Stolle, D., & Hooghe, M. (2011). Shifting inequalities: Patterns of exclusion and inclusion in emerging forms of political participation. *European Societies*, 13, 119–142.

Thelen, T. (2015). Care as social organization: Creating, maintaining and dissolving significant relations. *Anthropological Theory*, 15, 497–515.

Themudo, N. S. (2009). Gender and the Nonprofit Sector. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 38, 663–683.

Tronto, J. C. (1998). An ethic of care. *Generations*, 22, 15–21.

Vogel, C., Simonson, J., Ziegelmann, J. P., & Tesch-Römer, C. (2017). Freiwilliges Engagement von Frauen und Männern in Deutschland. In J. Simonson, C. Vogel, & C. Tesch-Römer (Eds.), *Freiwilliges Engagement in Deutschland: Der Deutsche Freiwilligensurvey 2014* (pp. 637–646). Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Vollmer, B., & Karakayali, S. (2017). The volatility of the discourse on refugees in Germany. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, 16, 118–139.

Williams, F. (2001). In and beyond New Labour: Towards a new political ethics of care. *Critical Social Policy*, 21(4), 467–493.

Wilson, J. (2012). Volunteerism research: A review essay. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 41, 176–212.

Wuthnow, R. (1991). *Acts of compassion: Caring for others and helping ourselves*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Wuthnow, R. (1995). *Learning to care: Elementary kindness in an age of indifference*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zamponi, L. (2017). Practices of solidarity: Direct social action, politicisation and refugee solidarity activism in Italy. *Mondi Migranti*, 3, 97–117.

Zick, A., Küpper, B., & Krause, D. (2016). *Gespaltene Mitte – Feindselige Zustände: Rechtsextreme Einstellungen in Deutschland 2016*. Bonn. English summary Retrieved from: http://www.fesdc.org/news-list/e/out-of-the-shadowsthe-new-right-in-germany/

PAPER TWO – SAME SAME BUT DIFFERENT

How the Play of Difference Intersects Female Refugee Support Workers' Constructions of a Common Identity

Accepted on 25 June 2019 by *Social Identities. Journal for the Study of Race, Nation and Culture*. To be published soon.

Abstract

As in most parts of Europe, the influx of a large number of refugees from the summer of 2015 on has greatly stirred German society and politics and deeply divided the population on how to deal with asylum seekers and immigration. This article enters this controversy by examining supporters committed to the pro-refugee side of the debate – female volunteers in refugee support work. It investigates how the volunteers interpret their relationship with refugees and adopts the social-psychological hypothesis claiming that the construction of a common identity helps decrease prejudice and facilitate intergroup relations. However, I go on to argue that manifestations of difference continuously interfere with these conceptions of 'sameness', as difference is fundamental for the construction of identities and meaning in general. Drawing on 22 in-depth interviews with female refugee support workers in Germany, this paper then traces how female volunteers imagine and locate 'sameness' and 'difference' when working with refugees. The article shows that while outwardly, participants are keen to develop a sense of a shared identity with the refugees, distinctions through power hierarchies or cultural or gender identities disrupt their experience in ambivalent, complex and covert ways.

Introduction

In the last years, cultural difference has become an ever more pervasive theme in the German public and political discourse. Particularly the so-called 'refugee crisis'[1], when vast numbers of refugees arrived in Europe in 2015 (Karakayali, 2018), has confronted Germany with issues of migration, integration and national identity that it sought to evade for so long (Holzberg, Kolbe & Zaborowski, 2018). Before long, the right-wing party *Alternative for Germany* capitalised on latent xenophobic attitudes resulting from growing unease with Chancellor Angela Merkel's refugee policy and became the strongest opposition party in 2017. In contrast, an unprecedented wave of empathy with refugees in the summer of 2015 initiated a strong and vocal volunteering movement that set out to counter anti-refugee sentiments and advocates for solidarity (Hamann & Karakayali, 2016). Thus, German society is currently marked by a deep split between an enthusiastic *Willkommenskultur* ('welcome culture') and hostile anti-immigration protests, humanitarian empathy and threatening securitisation responses, pointedly formulated: a clash between recognition and rejection of difference (Hamann & Karakayali, 2016, Holzberg et al., 2018). This paper enters this debate by investigating the most crucial incidences of difference that challenge refugee support volunteers, possibly the most ardent supports of pro-refugee solidarity, and thus must be addressed urgently to facilitate harmonious interactions in superdiverse societies. Indeed, Todd May (1997, p. 9) remarked that in times of racism, religious fundamentalism and the rejection of multiculturalism, 'the question of difference and of differences, of how to understand them and of how to respect them, needs to occupy us much more than it has.'

As the overwhelming majority of volunteers in refugee support work in Germany is female (Karakayali & Kleist, 2016) and gender and sexuality often dominated the media discourse (Dietze, 2017), this paper focuses on female volunteers only. More specifically, I aim to identify the contexts and situations where difference influences female volunteers' experience of working with refugees. Conversely, I will examine the discursive devices that volunteers use to establish a sense of sameness. In summary, I will investigate how the dynamics of bonding and boundary construction are expressed and how notions of sameness and difference interact in the everyday experiences and perceptions of the female volunteers.

This engagement with sameness and difference will be underpinned by a range of theoretical approaches, namely social psychology, and poststructuralist, feminist and postcolonial thought. While this method might seem overly eclectic to some, I argue that the complexities of integration and migration research demand a decidedly interdisciplinary

[1] Karakayali (2018) illustrates how the state and right-wing populists frame migration movements as 'crisis' to generate a feeling of decline and advance anti-immigrant arguments. As a result, even though it is widely used, the term is avoided in this article when not absolutely necessary.

research program. Equally, Stephen Castles (2010, p. 1569) insisted that although it is an interdisciplinary field, 'migration research is compartmentalised, with little analytical and methodological collaboration across boundaries.' As a consequence, this 'disciplinary bias' inhibits cross-fertilisation between different theoretical approaches to migration and integration. This paper aims to contribute to a more fruitful dialogue between social-psychological and sociological approaches of intergroup conflict and cooperation.

Based on social psychologists John F. Dovidio and Samuel Gaertner's (2005) 'Common Ingroup Identity Theory', I start from the premise that to reduce prejudice and facilitate the helping relationship, female volunteers construct a common identity with refugees based on commonalities and sameness. Gaertner and Dovidio essentially showed that perceptions of a common identity are integral for harmonious intergroup relations. Notwithstanding, I then argue that difference continually cuts through the research subjects' discursive constructions of sameness, as it is necessary for the production of meaning and identity. Conceptually, poststructuralism highlighted the importance of difference by demonstrating that meaning is constructed relationally and moved by the 'play' of differences (Derrida, 1978). Investigating how difference operates in the social field, feminism and postcolonialism offer enriching perspectives on processes of 'othering' and power relations between dominant and oppressed members of society. Moreover, gender and race/ethnicity represent two axes of differentiation that are foundational for this research and essential for feminism and postcolonialsm.

Consequently, I will first flesh out Gaertner and Dovidio's rationale to posit 'common identity' or sameness as essential for reducing prejudice. However, after criticising the shortcomings of their model I will engage with poststructuralist, feminist and postcolonial accounts of difference and show their relevance for volunteering in refugee support work. After a brief description of the methods used in this study, each part of the article's argument will be underpinned with empirical examples – firstly constructions of sameness, then differentiation mechanisms. The article also relates these results to similar findings by other researchers in the field. I will then conclude with a brief discussion drawing together all strands of the research and suggesting future academic and political pursuits.

Same same – The 'Common Ingroup Identity Model'

To investigate the cognitive roots of difference and the importance of commonality in social relations, social-psychological concepts prove particularly useful. They mostly centre on the study of prejudice, which Gordon Allport (1954, p. 9) defined as an 'antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalisation […] directed toward a group as a whole, or toward an individual because he is a member of that group.' From the beginning, prejudice was seen as a dangerous social problem to eradicate (Dovidio, 2001). However, Henri Tajfel (1981) showed that categorisation and the resulting generalisation is necessary for cognitive

functioning and for establishing a sense of belonging to a group. Together with his student James Turner, he developed Self-Categorization Theory (SCT), which demonstrates that individuals affiliate with groups on different levels of abstraction to sustain their self-concept (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Depersonalisation is one consequence of this process, which increases the perception of similarities within the ingroup and differences with the outgroup resulting in stereotyping and group polarisation (Turner, 1987). This can lead to social antagonism and ethnocentrism, where individuals upvalue their social group in comparison to others when certain conditions are given, e.g. strong identification with the ingroup and perceived relevance of the outgroup (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Consequently, social identity theory (SIT) shows that a person's sense of self is influenced by the different groups they are a member of and that to increase self-esteem, a person will try to enhance their group's status by comparing and discriminating against outgroups (Turner & Oakes, 1986). As a result, stereotyping involves considerable emotional engagement and is rather difficult to combat (Tajfel, 1981). Prejudice often accommodates itself in more hidden negative attitudes even when blatant, overt discrimination seems eliminated (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). Likewise, many manifestations of difference in the empirical discussion here might emanate from more subtle, covert and unconscious forms of stereotyping.

One of the first and most influential models for prejudice reduction was set forth in Gordon Allport's (1954) 'Intergroup Contact Hypothesis'. To reduce prejudice in intergroup contact, he claimed that four conditions have to be met: equal status within the situation; intergroup cooperation; common goals; and support of authorities, law or custom. Subsequently, Samuel L. Gaertner and John F. Dovidio (2005) introduced the 'Common Ingroup Identity Model' to study new forms of prejudice they termed 'aversive racism'. They argued that a single, more inclusive group identity can recategorise cognitive schemes to extend positive ingroup bias to former outgroup members, so that behaviour becomes more favourable. In other words, the essence of Gaertner and Dovidio's argument is that perceptions of 'sameness' through a common identity reduce prejudice and establish peaceful intergroup relations most effectively. This idea rings true with SIT which predicted that identification with a higher-level social identity leads to more inclusivity (Turner & Oakes, 1986). Regarding this article's research environment, a common identity could extend the willingness to help to outgroup members, as other studies have found that commonly, people prefer helping ingroup members (Nadler, 2016). In addition, Kunst, Thomsen, Sam & Berry (2015) claimed that a common, superordinate group identity also increases integration efforts by the majority group. In my study, I thus hypothesise that constructions of shared identity could be instrumental for facilitating the helping relationship between female volunteers and refugees.

However, I maintain that the construction of a common identity in Gaertner and Dovidio's model cannot proceed undisputedly and smoothly, as manifestations of difference

will continuously interfere. Indeed, SIT showed that persons are always members of various social groups that will become salient in different situations and contexts (Ellemers et al., 2002; Turner, 1987). Eventually, Dovidio, Kawakami & Gaertner (2002) also conceded that racial and ethnic identities are so strongly rooted in people's self-image that they cannot be easily discarded. Hence, they developed the concept of 'dual identity' that allows group members to hold more than one identity and even generalises beneficial effects to the whole racial or ethnic group. I argue that Gaertner and Dovidio overlooked the substantial power of multiple group identities and how they obstruct the construction and maintenance of a common identity repeatedly. Similarly, Kunst et al. (2015) pointed towards the danger that majority members control the common identity categorisation process and demand assimilation from minority members, to ultimately enhance their own group status. Processes of power and societal discourse are generally disregarded in much of Gaertner and Dovidio's work, and social psychology in general (Hook & Howarth, 2005; Branney, 2008). Mostly relying on experimental settings, social psychology runs the risk to simplify real-life encounters that are influenced by a myriad of social aspects. For these reasons, this article maintains that the Common Ingroup Identity Model, insisting on unconditional 'sameness', is deeply problematic, as intergroup relations are relentlessly cross-cut by difference.

<u>But different – the unavoidable intrusion of difference</u>

This article defends the view that difference is inevitably bound up with sameness. As Mark Currie (2004, 4) remarks, 'a category, a generalisation, a potential collective identity and a potential stereotype [...] involve this double process of saming and differentiating, of positing a common essence between members of the set and at the same time marking the differences that give the set its identity.' In the following I will review the importance of difference in three disciplines the concept most profoundly influenced, specifically poststructuralism, feminism and postcolonialism.

Among the first to elevate the concept of difference to the heart of theory and thus initiating structuralism was the Swiss linguist Ferdinand Saussure (1916(1977)). He suggested that the meaning of a sign is constituted by its relation to another sign, often its binary opposition (Currie, 2004). In other words, Saussure showed that 'reality is carved up in various ways according to the manifold patterns of sameness and difference which various languages provide' (Norris, 1982, p. 5). Particularly relevant here, Claude Lévi-Strauss (1970) extended the structure of difference to cultural codes. In this view, binary classifications into insiders and outsiders symbolically construct social order (Norris, 1982; Woodward, 1997), thus laying the foundation for feminist and postcolonial engagements with difference (Currie, 2004).

However, the poststructural movement soon contested Saussure's strong emphasis on a reductionist, abstract and static structure, particularly through Jacques Derrida (Currie,

2004). He insisted that the 'play' of difference continuously moves meaning, which is never fixed and stable (Derrida, 1978). Derrida thus helps understand the manifold and complex ways difference interacts with common identity constructs. This study thus draws on Derrida's neologism '*différance*', alluding to the verbs 'to defer' and 'to differ' (Culler, 1983). '*Différance*' captures how meaning is continuously delayed and put off in a concealed 'weave of differences' (Derrida, 1982). Consequently, relations to differing elements, which need not be present, create meaning and refer to past or future 'traces' in a complex chain of differences (Derrida, 2002(1979)). Crucially, Derrida (2002 (1979)) showed how binary oppositions form relations of power, where one pole usually dominates the other. The sameness the sign always postulates profoundly represses and excludes the actual difference it depends upon (Currie, 2004), an idea of great significance for this article's contestation of the 'Common Ingroup Identity Theory'. Ultimately, Derrida (2002 (1979)) suggested that all identities in Western culture are shaped by hierarchical binary oppositions, such as nature/culture or man/woman (Rattansi, 1994). This linguistic operation is 'laden with social and political significance' (Currie 2004, p. 17), opening up potentials for feminist and postcolonial critique of repressive constructions of the 'other' in social identity processes.

As gender constitutes one of the main axes of difference in this study, feminist engagements with the question of difference are particularly worth looking at. Feminism has been vacillating between the ideas of equality, or sameness, and difference since its inception (Crosby, 1992). On the one hand, feminist activism relies on limitation of sexual difference and solidarity among a unified category of the 'woman' (Rhode, 1990; Offen, 1990). As I will show below, the research subjects use a similar strategy to counter right-wing arguments by stressing the common category 'human'. On the other hand, the difference between male and female, or woman as the 'other' to man, constitutes the basis of feminist theory (Crosby, 1990).

To a large extent, feminism understood the power of difference as processes of 'othering', which are at work here concerning refugees. Simone de Beauvoir (2011(1949)) pioneered the view that the category 'woman' has been constructed through biology, historical conventions and internalised cultural myths in relation to the male norm, as its 'other, its inessential negative, and is thus culturally produced (Kaufmann, 1986). Later, poststructuralist feminists such as Julia Kristeva and Luce Irigaray criticised this rigid dualism of the sexes by recognising the non-binary, fluid multiplicity of women's identities (Offen, 1990; Currie, 2004). Particularly Irigaray (1994) stressed the positive potential of difference to break through the oppressive structure of patriarchal culture. When analysing female volunteers' engagement with difference, Irigaray's argument helps resist the urge to frame all instances of difference as binary, negative and destructive. Julia Kristeva (1991), then, demonstrated that the 'other' is instrumental in processes of self-construction. As a result, to live peacefully with difference we must address the stranger within ourselves (Kristeva,

1991). In line with this paper's argument, Kristeva thus revealed that identity and difference are deeply intertwined.

In recent years, the question of difference again unsettled the feminist movement, as women of colour started to question the assumed universal female identity posited by white feminists and identity politics (Crosby, 1992). Black feminists such as Audre Lorde (1984) exposed how white women obscured the experiences of black women and overlooked the interplay of racism and sexism. As a consequence, Kimberle Crenshaw's (1989) concept of 'intersectionality' became a fundamental principle in contemporary feminism. Intersectional approaches pay attention to the complex ways in which different positionalities such as gender, race and class intersect in the construction of identity and discrimination of minorities (Crenshaw, 1989; Lorde, 1984). This article finds particularly valuable the observation that common identity inevitably suppresses other differences, even if this identity may be instrumental for achieving certain (political) goals.

Another mechanism of differentiation between German volunteers and refugees is race, culture and ethnicity. This article thus takes inspiration from postcolonial concerns with the construction of cultural and racial otherness through the dominant 'West' (Hall, 1992). At its heart, postcolonialism considers the 'boundary marking' between self and other as integral to define and reassert personal and collective identities (Rutherford, 1990). Western nations like Germany rely on oftentimes binary classificatory systems (Woodward, 1997) that assign minority groups such as refugees the status of 'constitutive outsides' to mainstream society (Hall, 1996, 1997). As Stuart Hall (1992, p. 189) maintains, Western discourse uses 'crude and simplistic distinctions' such as civilisation – savagery, reason – emotion, and culture – nature to construct the racial 'other' and assert its own superiority (Hall, 1997). In his study of 'Orientalism', Edward Said (1978) uncovered how colonialists and ethnologists historically codified these discursive strategies in networks of knowledge and social, political and cultural institutions that still operate in the research participants' social environment today. Essentially, Europe still exerts authority over a supposedly 'underdeveloped' Orient that is a source of both fear and pleasure, familiarity and strangeness (Bhabha, 1983). Particularly relevant for my purposes is Nira Yuval-Davis' (1997) assertion that women play an essential role in reproducing the nation and its cultural identity as symbolic border guards. Besides, they represent the endangered collectivity in need of defence against the Orientalist 'rapist' (Rattansi, 1994). Lastly, inspired by Derrida's 'play' of difference, postcolonialism also sheds light on the highly ambiguous, fragmented and disordered processes of real-life othering (Bhabha, 1983; Hall, 1996).

In the current German context, a new culturalist racism again lays emphasis on difference to react against the fears and transformations the refugee influx triggered. The 'refugee crisis' only further intensified the fundamental anxieties accompanying inevitable societal change in Germany. Refugees in particular rupture our sense of belonging and

remind us of the experience of change, loss and disruption in modernity (Rutherford, 2007). An illusion of stable, homogeneous and absolute sameness then seems to ban the threat of difference posed by refugees (Gilroy, 1997). Therefore, 'calculating the relationship between identity and difference, sameness and otherness is an intrinsically political operation.' (Gilroy, 2000, p. 99)

Across all these theoretical fields, it becomes clear that difference is inescapable even within constructions of sameness. The empirical discussion below will be guided by a poststructuralist emphasis on the fluid, relational and ambivalent character of difference; feminist challenges to unified common identities that risk overlooking differences within; and postcolonial descriptions of power processes in racialised, culturalised and ethnicised 'othering'.

Methods

This article is based on 22 semi-structured face-to-face interviews with female refugee support work volunteers in four different locations in Germany. To account for differences between urban and rural areas, two fieldwork sites were bigger cities – Berlin and Hamburg – and two sites were smaller towns. Moreover, one of the towns is located in East Germany and one in West Germany, as attitudes towards refugees are often considered to be more hostile in East Germany (Karakayali & Kleist, 2016). I obtained access to potential interviewees through contacting refugee support work initiatives, where usually a coordinator distributed the request and organised a number of interviews. In all cases, I did not know the participants before the interviews. Some interviews however were organised through common acquaintances. Beforehand, the research design was examined for the need for ethical approval by the institutional ethics commission, but as it did not include vulnerable populations, incentives or overly sensitive topics, this has not been the case. At almost all research sites, I had the opportunity to observe volunteering situations and sites first hand, which allowed me to collect additional data on the volunteering environment. The interviews were carried out between May and July 2018 and lasted one hour on average. Participants were between 20 and 70 years old and came from a range of occupational backgrounds, from students to working professionals and pensioners. Their relationships with refugees varied in depth and length. While some research subjects dealt with a larger number of refugees by providing assistance in a certain domain or looking after groups, others developed close links to particular refugees or refugee families that they assisted in all matters of life. The interview guide included questions on motivations for volunteering and prior expectations, narrative descriptions of the voluntary work including any potential challenges or rewards, and the impact of the voluntary work on the volunteers themselves. It concluded with a section on broader topics such as integration, the current right-wing discourse or gender. While relying on the same interview guide in all interviews, I used a

relatively open and flexible interviewing method inspired by Lofland's (1971 'guided conversations'. This approach allowed me to focus in-depth on aspects important to the participants, or skip or change the order of elements. After obtaining informed consent, all interviews except for one were digitally recorded and transcribed verbatim. Following principles of qualitative content analysis (Mayring, 2000), a code frame based on the overarching categories sameness and difference that link to the research questions was developed. The analysis of the first set of interviews further refined these categories and added a number of subcategories of the main themes that emerged. I then added or removed categories successively in feedback loops when analysing the transcripts of the remaining interviews in the order they were conducted. . To ensure the privacy and safety of the participants, this article omits names and other identifying information.

Findings

Same same – Abstract and concrete discovery of common identity

Taking up Gaertner and Dovidio's (2005) 'Common Identity' theory to reduce prejudice, this section shows the argumentative strategies female volunteers employ to imagine 'sameness'. Altogether, they either construct similarity on a wider, abstract level, or find commonalities in concrete, everyday life situations.

The more theoretical, broader line of reasoning first and foremost refers to a 'common humanity' that unites all human beings and therefore the volunteers and the refugees as well. As SIT predicted, salience of this most abstract social identity can change the perception of former outgroups and induce more prosocial behaviour (Ellemers et. al, 2002). On the one hand, the recognition of similarity leads to categorising others as group members, as specified in SCT (Turner, 1987). On the other, the identification as a group then often exaggerates similarities, as the idea of depersonalisation suggests (Turner & Oakes, 1986). These two processes will possibly always interact and be hard to divide empirically. Common humanity and, in connection, universal human rights, were present in all of the 22 interviews and was also mentioned most often out of all 'abstract' themes of sameness. As Dovidio, Love, Schellhaas and Hewstone (2017) found that majority-group members accentuate commonalities more, this hardly comes as a surprise. For example, one volunteer from Baden-Württemberg believed:

> We are all born by a mother and at the end of life, we die.[2] *Participant 5, small town West*

Shephard Masocha (2015, p. 570-71) demonstrated that this linguistic strategy normalises

[2] All quotes have been translated from German to English by the author.

‘asylum seekers as individual human beings [...] constituted as *just like us*’ and thus makes them worthy of help and a potential resource. Additionally, participants derived common humanity through recognising that ‘they’ have the same needs as ‘us’ – be it food, shelter, or love. Ultimately, this linguistic strategy for the volunteers implied respect and tolerance, approaching refugees ‘on an equal footing’ and a willingness to involve them in any decisions or activities using what one Hamburg volunteer called a ‘participatory approach’. Hamann & Karakayali (2016, p. 81) observed a similar ‘a culture of recognition of differences’ in other ‘welcome initiatives’ in Germany. Correspondingly, one Berlin volunteer called for a

> return to, somehow, the interpersonal values that are simply independent of, which religion, which skin colour, whatever […] Not paying so much attention to otherness. *Participant 14, Berlin*

Social justice, solidarity and human rights also featured strongly in appeals for asylum seekers, based on a sense of cosmopolitan responsibility and ideas of interconnection and common identity that are commonly observed in the literature (e.g. Austin & Fozdar, 2018; Nightingale, Quayle & Muldoon, 2017; Nowicka, Krzyzowski & Ohm, 2019). Participants drew on notions of equal opportunities, similar values or justice, as one volunteer illustrates:

> They are humans like you and I and they have the same entitlement to a good and fair life. Like us, the lottery win born in Germany. *Participant 18, Hamburg*

On this level, the participants also solidarised with refugees in a commitment to anti-racism and countering (perceived) xenophobic responses by the state or German society, a stance volunteers have also adopted elsewhere (Stivens, 2018) and can be conducive to a shared identity (Drury & Reicher, 2009). This activism may represent a ‘shared goal’ that could lead to a greater sense of common identity according to Dovidio et al. (2017). Eventually, Hamann and Karakayali (2016) maintained that the volunteer movement played an instrumental role in countering the right-wing protests that emerged in Germany soon after the ‘summer of welcome’ in 2015.

A final interesting finding emerged when over half of the research subjects referred to children when framing the ‘proper’ way to deal with cultural difference. Supposedly, children constitute the ideal subjects of integration as they were perceived to not ‘see’ difference, to embody sameness, and to be more adaptive and innocent. They thus represent the ideal ‘deserving migrant’ (Vollmer & Karakayali, 2017). When reflecting on integration strategies, one volunteer suggested:

> You’d simply have to target the most unbiased and somehow toughest members of our society, children […]They don’t care about all these differences at all, the

> only thing that counts is, I don't know, if you are good at football or something like that. *Participant 14, Berlin*

On a more everyday, concrete level, commonalities were established through common interests or activities. Specific group similarities are particularly conducive to establishing a common identity (Gaertner et al., 1993). Hence, Whyte, Romme Larsen & Fog Olwig (2018) suggested that local everyday practices such as football help produce pragmatic 'relations of mutuality' that encourage the incorporation of asylum seekers into the local community. In this study, particularly food and cooking played an important role, but common hobbies like poetry, music or art also served as a basis for a shared identity with particular refugees. After a while, then, close relationships and friendships between volunteers and refugees developed, even after the latter had left the camps and were not directly dependent on help any more. In one instance, a female volunteer and a refugee began a romantic relationship, which bundled a number of strategies to achieve a shared identity – common interests, adaptation to German everyday life and respect for cultural difference. In sum, friendship and intimacy are hypothesised to provide especially conducive conditions for positive intergroup relations (Pettigrew, Tropp, Wagner & Christ, 2011).

The most common form, however, of invoking 'sameness' operated through emotions such as fun, trust or empathy. Particularly the latter often served as a bridge to connect with refugees. Indeed, Dovidio et al. (2017) assigned a critical role to affective processes in the Common Ingroup Identity Model, similarly to SIT (Drury & Reicher, 2009). Correspondingly, Holzberg et al. (2018) and Vollmer and Karakayali (2018) observed a frequent appeal to empathy in the German discourse on refugees that both justified humanitarian action and countered impersonal state responses and right-wing hostility.

> Well I think that friendliness and that showing, you are not all the same to us and we understand you as far as we can, because nobody can understand how you are feeling, and we try to help you, is very important. So, I try to treat the people like I would like to be treated if I arrived in Syria now and didn't speak a word of Arabic. *Participant 3, Berlin*

A more ambivalent strategy of constructing a common identity demanded that refugees adapt to German life. Taking up German everyday life through school, work, learning the language or developing relationships with Germans, the refugees supposedly become more 'like us'. As observed elsewhere, for women, particularly education and language appear crucial in becoming 'German' (Braun, 2018). Particularly in Germany, this attitude often prevails as integration policy still demands for immigrants to assimilate by giving up their differences (Holzberg et al., 2018). Thus, ultimately the members of the dominant group set the meaning of the common identity for everyone (Frankenberg, 1993).

Finally, a perceived shared identity also sprang from similar experiences such as having experienced migration either themselves or in their family, a hint at common fate and experiences of conflict that according to SIT increase group cohesion (Drury & Reicher, 2009; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). In six cases, participants asserted that they could empathise with refugees because they themselves had immigrated or moved and thus knew how it felt to be perceived as foreign. Interestingly, two volunteers interpreted their experience of moving from East Germany to West Germany or vice versa as a 'migration experience' as well, lending support to Daniel Kubiak's and Naika Foroutan's (2018) recent assertion that East Germans' experiences are comparable to migration experiences.

> So I just turned 18 when the wall came down, I actually lost my home as well and, this is not comparable, but ultimately I also freshly had to find my way in this society and I also know how hard it is. *Participant 17, Hamburg*

Another four volunteers had family that fled from Eastern Europe to Germany after World War Two as 'Vertriebene' (Displaced Persons) and believed that this influenced their motivation and approach to volunteering. Similarly, gender identity provided a frame for a shared identity as well. Many research subjects reported that they got along better with female refugees, for example bonding over the experience of motherhood (Braun, 2017; Stivens, 2017).

But different – The play of difference

Centrally, in this paper I argue that the above-described strategies to construct a common identity are complicated or even contradicted by the incessant materialisation of difference. The 'colour- and power-evasiveness' evident in these certainly well-intended constructions of sameness still preserves power hierarchies, where the speaker can allow difference only when it is safe, nonthreatening or makes the white self feel good (Frankenberg, 1993). The following section will lay out the manifold forms in which difference interrupts feelings of sameness and establishes power hierarchies within refugee support work, be it consciously or unconsciously.

Power and privilege

In all interviews, usually at some point a 'multilayered web of power relations' (Braun, 2017, p. 40) surfaced more or less openly. Particularly common were strategies or expectations that relied on a certain power hierarchy and constructed difference through domination and subjugation. Patronising behaviour witnessed on somebody else or displayed personally constitutes a particularly suitable example, as the German refugee support movement has been criticised for its paternalist tendencies before (Omwenyeke,

2016). Occasionally, participants claimed to know better than the refugees themselves what their needs were, as frequently assumed in humanitarian aid (Kapoor, 2005). In some instances, the participants talked in a condescending tone, infantilised the refugees and adopted the role of the teacher, guide or parent making them 'fit for society'. As Braun (2017) proposed, framing refugees as uncivilised and deficient, in need of charitable European help, plainly connects to colonial discourses of Orientalist othering. In the interviews, however, a paternalist attitude not necessarily included a rejection of refugees, an attitude that Nightingale et al. (2017) called 'ambivalent paternalism'. One volunteer exhibited a very strong patronising attitude, for example claiming that

> But ultimately, if we want that they don't stay in a state of dependency forever, you actually have to also kick them a bit. Demand something. And also just make them come down to earth a bit. *Participant 17, Hamburg*

Moreover, this attitude often involved misinterpreting the refugees' needs, which a number of participants critically reflected. A common disappointment for the volunteers resulted from refugees rejecting goods and services they organised. For instance, volunteers organised activities such as sports classes or women's circles which were sparsely attended because, as the volunteers speculated later, they did not take into account the actual circumstances and needs of the refugees' everyday lives. One volunteer thus pondered whether integration should also entail the obligation of the German society to assess the needs of refugees, because as she remarked, a refugee might not be too keen on learning the trumpet to join the town band.

Expecting gratitude comprises another crucial mechanism at work in othering processes in refugee support work, which numerous studies observe both in direct interactions and in public discourse on refugees (Braun, 2017; Heins & Unrau, 2018; Holmes & Castañeda, 2016; Vollmer & Karakayali, 2018). Although participants often denied expecting gratitude from refugees, implicitly the theme arose in the majority of the interviews. Interestingly, Volker Heins and Christine Unrau (2018) discovered that Marcel Mauss' (1954) thoughts on gift exchange played a critical role in Germany's 'welcome culture'. They interpreted the voluntary help as 'arrival gifts' that implicate expectations of reciprocity to restore the social order between the two groups. Furthermore, gratitude plays an instrumental role in framing the 'deservingness' of the refugee (Holmes and Castañeda, 2016), as a perceived lack of gratitude seemed to make some participants less inclined to help certain refugees. Hence it became apparent that the help the refugees receive is conditional on implicit expectations, such as conforming to the ideal of the deserving migrant, obeying certain rules and not challenging established power hierarchies.

Difference as 'culture'

Frequently, participants referred to difference more directly by remarking on the other 'culture'[3] of refugees. Strikingly, apart from a general reference to values and the significance of family, religion emerged most regularly as a marker of culture. As Mahmood Mamdani (2002) illustrated, this essentialist 'culture talk' pits the modern, liberal European against the premodern, fundamentalist Muslim, ultimately extending religious convictions to the secular and political field as well.

Participants often saw the experience of different cultures as a motivation or reward of voluntary work and thus were interested in and fascinated by cultural practices. The volunteers drew parallels to getting to know other cultures on holiday and found they could experience the benefits of travelling right on their doorsteps now. They appreciated what they could learn through intercultural contact, for example on geopolitical issues, the actual experience of refugees in Germany, or religion (Hamann & Karakayali, 2016). One volunteer illustrated:

> Before, I studied ethnology. And I'm just also interested in how people live outside of Germany and here was the opportunity to get to know very many people from very many different nations, without having to collect money for research expeditions. *Participant 21, Hamburg*

This strategy of perceiving the colonial figure as the idealised 'exotic' other, however, was instrumental in European self-perceptions and cosmopolitan aspirations throughout history (Loftsdóttir, 2018).

On a wider level, occasionally participants framed refugees as an enrichment for German society because of their personal fascination with the refugees' cultures. As a consequence, they praised the creative potential of difference (Hamann & Karakayali, 2016). Indeed, Serhat Karakayali (2018) asserted that the experience of 'crisis' surrounding refugees in Germany prompted a critical questioning and transformation of established customs. Even so, Kathryn Woodward (1997) remarked that the celebration of difference and diversity still relies on binary oppositions that produce symbolic boundaries of othering. As one volunteer summarised concisely:

> And then you just always think, we are here on the island of the blissful, the way we do it, the way we live, that's how the world is, that's how it has to be. And that's how it's right. And when you see, other cultures, they also don't just live in

[3] I am aware that this bounded, territorial, static and homogenising definition of 'culture' is deeplyp problematic and outdated in social science. Still, this is how the term is still mostly used in public discourse and the participants' narratives.

> misery. And even if it looks very differently there economically, maybe they are still content. […] But to realise, we are not the hub of the world, but there are other people as well. If you look on the map, how small Europe is. And how large Africa and how large the Near East is as well. That brings you down to earth a bit, I think. *Participant 7, small town West*

Nonetheless, perceived different cultural practices at times also irritated participants, or even were rejected. Particularly attitudes towards childrearing, religious practices, and different perceptions of politeness, reliability and tidiness volunteers claimed to be incapable to comprehend, or they just generally remarked on different 'mentalities' they perceived as difficult. As a result, occasionally some volunteers preferred one group of refugees, for example Arabs over Africans. Furthermore, cultural attitudes towards women constituted a major source of irritation as well, as will be elaborated in the next section.

Gender difference

As predicted in feminist theory, gender identities and attitudes toward the emancipation of women played a central role in most participants' perception of difference. Most commonly, the perceived dominating behaviour of male refugees irritated them profoundly. Some volunteers, for example, told stories where they felt disrespected by male refugees or observed attempts to dictate the arrangement of the relationship either with volunteers or within refugee groups.

> There were situations where men were really cocky along the lines of 'she doesn't understand me anyway'. I simply behaved equally rude and dominant and made myself heard. […] And there were some rows showing disrespect for women that I just didn't accept, and made it known. They still don't respect me, but it can't be helped. *Participant 4, Berlin*

Moreover, the – most often only assumed – danger of sexual assaults by male refugees emerged as a marker of difference. The participants often related negative attitudes towards gender equality to an implicitly backwards culture. Accordingly, this study again underscores that gender is intrinsically linked to ethnic and racial identities as constitutive categories of social relations and processes of exclusion (Anthias & Yuval-Davis, 1992) in intersections that Joane Nagel (2003) termed 'ethnosexual'. Ruth Frankenberg (1993) showed how discourse frames the sexuality of racialised men as threatening and enormous and thus constructs them as hypersexualised aggressors, a debate that can be traced back to colonial and orientalist legitimations of European domination (Rattansi 1994). In fact, women are implicated in and sometimes draw on 'ethnosexual' power mechanisms as well (Frankenberg, 1993; Dietze, 2017). In Germany, these mechanisms have become ubiquitous

again after the supposed attacks of Muslim refugees on German women on New Year's Eve 2015/16 in Cologne. Ethnosexist rhetoric depicted particularly the Arab male as a sexual danger to the German woman, and thus the nation, that cannot be tolerated (Dietze, 2017). Interestingly, in many cases the volunteers expected to encounter male dominance among refugees or were concerned about sexual infringements but were quick to add that they never experienced such incidences themselves:

> At the start I wondered, how do they actually feel about women helping them? Well, they do have a certain pride. And how do they feel, they come into a foreign country and then a women helps them and that's totally taken for granted. Can they even accept help? And I realise, they can definitely accept it. *Participant 8, small town West*

Thus, ethnosexism serves as a powerful public discourse to cement power relations in German society, without necessarily being grounded in actual facts and experiences. This further lends support to the argument that gender issues are among the most decisive boundary marking mechanisms today (Holzberg et al., 2018).

In another ethnosexual narrative, some volunteers took issue with the oppression of female refugees, often bound up with implicit or explicit intentions to 'free' these women from their paternalistic culture and emancipate them. The gendered and racialised contrast between 'the modern, emancipated female volunteer and the female, oppressed refugee plays a central role' in the German refugee support movement (Braun, 2017, p. 39). Therefore, as highlighted by intersectional feminism, differences between women do significantly impact on wider power relations. Indeed, Lila Abu-Lughod (2002) argued that concerns about Muslim women perceived as needing to be saved by the enlightened West serve as a crucial tool to construct difference and superiority since the 'war on terror' began.

> The older boy gives her a hard time. […] These rascals. They are inculcated by their father, he wanted to forbid the mother to go to the swimming course. And there we said, Amri, this far and no further, that's your mother, not your wife. Well, from the cradle they are inculcated. *Participant 13, small town East*

Surprisingly in this context and the theoretical frame, some volunteers also used these clashes around gender to question their own prejudice or cultural convictions. Forced marriage, the headscarf or the actual distribution of power within the refugees' family relationships were some examples that prompted participants to reflect on their own habits and convictions. This suggests that even such an emotionally laden and deeply ingrained discourse as gender holds the potential to critically reflect and incorporate difference.

> We always say so viciously, forced marriage. […] But then some refugees also said […] our parents know us from an early age, they roughly know what's good for me. That fits. And look at your marriages, do they work better? And then you start to reflect, we say oh these bad guys, and the poor girls. *Participant 7, small town West*

Conclusion

This article showed that, consistent with the social-psychological Common Ingroup Identity Model, female refugee support work volunteers in Germany established a sense of 'sameness' through both abstract reasoning and everyday connections. Nevertheless, manifestations of difference along the lines of power, culture and gender repeatedly cross-cut these propositions more or less openly, as predicted by poststructuralist, feminist and postcolonial emphasis on difference. Processes of power along various axes such as gender or ethnicity regularly permeated the relationship between volunteers and refugees. Consequently, this article maintains that the construction of a common identity is much more complex and problematic than often assumed, as difference can never be eradicated completely. Thus, I argue that social psychology needs to recognise the power of discourse more firmly, and incorporate inevitable expressions of difference in any model of prejudice reduction or intergroup relations.

Furthermore, the question of difference troubles Germany and many other societies to an extent that the resulting social divisions and political conflicts threaten social cohesion and democratic institutions substantially. As global societies will only become more diverse, we urgently require a practicable and sustainable model that facilitates peaceful group relations in a superdiverse world. Most approaches developed in the last decades have been questioned academically or politically, be it assimilation theory, multiculturalism or theories of integration. Hence, this article calls for renewed scholarly attention and political dedication to develop strategies that both take into account the need for a common identity, and the reality of difference and power continuously interfering in social relations. Activists in refugee support work might act as a good starting point for the analysis of everyday negotiations of difference. While being confronted with difference on a daily basis, they still manage to uphold productive and often amicable relationships with their cultural 'other' and advance the positive recognition of diversity on a societal and often political level as well. Future research could thus investigate refugee support work volunteers from the perspective of political strategies on diversity.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

References

Abu-Lughod, L. (2002). Do Muslim Women Really Need Saving? Anthropological Reflections on Cultural Relativism and Its Others. *American Anthropologist*, *104*(3), 783–790.

Allport, G. (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice*. New York: Addison-Wesley.

Anthias, F., & Yuval-Davis, N. (1992). *Racialized Boundaries: Race, nation, gender, colour and class and the anti-racist struggle*. London, New York: Routledge.

Austin, C., & Fozdar, F. (2018). Framing asylum seekers: the uses of national and cosmopolitan identity frames in arguments about asylum seekers. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, *25*(3), 245–265.

Beauvoir, S. de. (2011 (1949)). *The Second Sex*. New York: Vintage Books.

Bhabha, H. K. (1983). The Other Question.: Homi K Bhabha reconsiders the stereotype and colonial discourse. *Screen*, *24*(6), 18–36.

Branney, P. (2008). Subjectivity, Not Personality: Combining Discourse Analysis and Psychoanalysis. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *2*(2), 574–590.

Braun, K. (2017). Decolonial Perspectives on Charitable Spaces of “Welcome Culture” in Germany. *Social Inclusion*, *5*(3), 38–48.

Castles, S. (2010). Understanding Global Migration: A Social Transformation Perspective. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(10), 1565–1586.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics. *The University of Chicago Legal Forum*, *168*, 139–167.

Crosby, C. (1992). Dealing with Differences. In J. Butler & J. W. Scott (Eds.), *Feminists Theorize the Political* (pp. 130–143). London, New York: Routledge.

Currie, M. (2004). *Difference*. London: Routledge.

Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and Difference*. London: Routledge.

Derrida, J. (1982). Différance. In J. Derrida (Ed.), *Margins of Philosophy* (pp. 1–27). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Derrida, J. (2002 (1972)). *Positions: Translated and Annotated by Alan Bass*. London, New York: Continuum.

Dietze, G. (2017). Ethnosexismus: Sex-Mob-Narrative um die Kölner Sylvesternacht. *Movements: Journal for Critical Migration and Border Regime Studies*, *2*(1), 177–185.

Dovidio, J. F. (2001). On the Nature of Contemporary Prejudice: The Third Wave. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*(4), 829–849.

Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., & Gaertner, S. L. (2002). Reducing Contemporary Prejudice: Combating Explicit and Implicit Bias at the Individual and Intergroup Level. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination: The Claremont Symposium on Applied Social Psychology* (pp. 137–163). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Dovidio, J. F., Love, A., Schellhaas, F. M. H., & Hewstone, M. (2017). Reducing intergroup bias through intergroup contact: Twenty years of progress and future directions. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *20*(5), 606–620.

Drury, J., & Reicher, S. (2009). Collective Psychological Empowerment as a Model of Social Change: Researching Crowds and Power. *Journal of Social Issues*, 65(4), 707–725.

Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (2002). Self and Social Identity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 161–186.

Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White women, race matters: The social construction of whiteness*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2005). Understanding and Addressing Contemporary Racism: From Aversive Racism to the Common Ingroup Identity Model. *Journal of Social Issues*, *61*(3), 615–639.

Gilroy, P. (1997). Diaspora and the Detours of Identity. In K. Woodward (Ed.), *Culture, Media and Identities Series. Identity and Difference* (pp. 301–343). Sage Publications.

Gilroy, P. (2000). *Against Race. Imagining Political Culture beyond the Color Line*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press.

Hall, S. (1992). The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power. In S. Hall & B. Gieben (Eds.), *The Formations of Modern Society* (pp. 185–227). Oxford: Polity Press.

Hall, S. (1996). Introduction. Who needs 'Identity'? In S. Hall & P. Du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of Cultural Identity* (pp. 1–17). London: Sage Publications.

Hall, S. (1997). The Spectacle of the 'Other'. In S. Hall (Ed.), *Representation. Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices* (pp. 225–279). London: Sage Publications.

Hamann, U., & Karakayali, S. (2016). Practicing Willkommenskultur: Migration and Solidarity in Germany. *Intersections. East European Journal of Society and Politics*, *2*(4), 69–86.

Heins, V. M., & Unrau, C. (2018). Refugees welcome: Arrival gifts, reciprocity, and the integration of forced migrants. *Journal of International Political Theory*, *14*(2), 223–239.

Holmes, S. M., & Castañeda, H. (2016). Representing the “European refugee crisis” in Germany and beyond: Deservingness and difference, life and death. *American Ethnologist*, *43*(1), 12–24.

Holzberg, B., Kolbe, K., & Zaborowski, R. (2018). Figures of Crisis: The Delineation of (Un)Deserving Refugees in the German Media. *Sociology*, *52*(3), 534–550.

Hook, D., & Howarth, C. (2005). Future Directions for a Critical Social Psychology of Racism/Antiracism. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *15*(6), 506–512.

Irigaray, L. (1994). *Thinking the Difference: For a Peaceful Revolution*. New York: Routledge.

Kapoor, I. (2005). Participatory Development, Complicity and Desire. *Third World Quarterly*, *26*(8), 1203–1220.

Karakayali, S. (2018). The Flüchtlingskrise in Germany: Crisis of the Refugees, by the Refugees, for the Refugees. *Sociology*, *52*(3), 606–611.

Karakayali, S., & Kleist, J. O. (2016) *Strukturen und Motive der ehrenamtlichen Flüchtlingsarbeit (EFA) in Deutschland 2. Forschungsbericht. Ergebnisse einer explorativen Umfrage vom November/Dezember 2015.* Berlin: Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin.

Kaufmann, D. (1986). Simone de Beauvoir: Questions of Difference and Generation. *Yale French Studies*, *72*, 121–131.

Kristeva, J. (1991). *Strangers to Ourselves*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kubiak, D., Foroutan, N. (2018). Ausschluss und Abwertung: Was Muslime und Ostdeutsche verbindet. *Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik*, 7/2018, 93-102.

Kunst, J. R., Thomsen, L., Sam, D. L., & Berry, J. W. (2015). "We Are in This Together": Common Group Identity Predicts Majority Members' Active Acculturation Efforts to Integrate Immigrants. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *41*(10), 1438–1453.

Lévi-Strauss, C. (1970). *The Raw and the Cooked*. London: Cape.

Lofland, J. (1971). *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis*. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing.

Loftsdóttir, K. (2018). Global citizens, exotic others, and unwanted migrants: Mobilities in and of Europe. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, *25*(3), 302–319.

Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches by Audre Lorde*. Berkeley: Crossing Press.

Mamdani, M. (2002). Good Muslim, Bad Muslim: A Political Perspective on Culture and Terrorism. *American Anthropologist*, *104*(3), 766–775.

Masocha, S. (2015). Construction of the 'other' in social workers' discourses of asylum seekers. *Journal of Social Work*, *15*(6), 569–585.

Mauss, M. (1954). *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*. London: Cohen & West Ltd.

May, T. (1997). *Reconsidering Difference: Nancy, Derrida, Levinas, and Deleuze*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Mayring, Philipp (2000). Qualitative Content Analysis. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 1(2), Art. 20,

Nadler, A. (2016). Intergroup helping relations. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *11*(10), 64–68.

Nagel, J. (2003). *Race, ethnicity, and sexuality: Intimate intersections, forbidden frontiers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nightingale, A., Quayle, M., & Muldoon, O. (2017). “It’s just heart breaking”: Doing inclusive political solidarity or ambivalent paternalism through sympathetic discourse within the “refugee crisis” debate. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *27*(2), 137-146.

Norris, C. (1982). *Deconstruction: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.

Nowicka, M., Krzyzowski, L., & Ohm, D. (2019). Transnational solidarity, the refugees and open societies in Europe. *Current Sociology*, *67*(3), 383–400.

Offen, K. (1990). Feminism and Sexual Difference in Historical Perspective. In D. L. Rhode (Ed.), *Theoretical Perspectives on Sexual Difference* (pp. 13–20). New Haven, London: Yale University Press.

Omwenyeke, S. (2016). Solidarität, kein Paternalismus. In D. Weber (Ed.), *Forum Migration Mai 2016* (p. 5). Düsseldorf: DGB Bildungswerk BUND e.V.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Meertens, R. W. (1995). Subtle and blatant prejudice in Western Europe. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *25*, 57–75.

Pettigrew, T. F., Tropp, L. R., Wagner, U., & Christ, O. (2011). Recent advances in intergroup contact theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *35*(3), 271–280.

Rattansi, A. (1994). 'Western' Racisms, ethnicities and identities in a 'postmodern' frame. In A. Rattansi & S. Westwood (Eds.), *Racism, Modernity and Identity: On the Western Front* (pp. 15–86). Cambridge: Polity.

Rutherford, J. (1990). A Place Called Home: Identity and the Cultural Politics of Difference. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity: community, culture, difference* (pp. 9–27). London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Rutherford, J. (2007). *After Identity*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin.

Saussure, F. d. (1949). *Cours de linguistique générale*. Paris: Payot.

Stivens, M. (2018). Gendering cosmopolitanisms: Hospitality and the asylum seeker Other. *Women's Studies International Forum* 67, 85-93.

Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human Groups & Social Categories: Studies in Social Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Monterey, Calif.: Brooks/Cole Pub. Co.

Turner, J. C. (1987). *Rediscovering the Social Group: A Self-Categorisation Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Turner, J. C., & Oakes, P. J. (1986). The significance of the social identity concept for social psychology with reference to individualism, interactionism and social influence. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 25(3), 237–252.

Vollmer, B., & Karakayali, S. (2018). The Volatility of the Discourse on Refugees in Germany. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, 16(1-2), 118-139.

Whyte, Z., Romme Larsen, B., & Fog Olwig, K. (2018). New neighbours in a time of change: Local pragmatics and the perception of asylum centres in rural Denmark. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *0*(0), 1–17.

Woodward, K. (1997). Concepts of identity and difference. In K. Woodward (Ed.), *Culture, Media and Identities series. Identity and Difference* (pp. 8–48). London: Sage Publications.

Yuval-Davis, N. (1997). *Gender & Nation*. London: Sage Publications.

PAPER THREE – TAKING CARE OF THE OTHER

Visions of a Caring Integration in Female Refugee Support Work

Published as: Schmid, S. (2019). Taking Care of the Other: Visions of a Caring Integration in Female Refugee Support Work. *Social Inclusion 7(2)*, 118-127. http://dx.doi.org/10.17645/si.v7i2.1964

This article is part of the issue "The European Refugee Controversy: Civil Solidarity, Cultural Imaginaries and Political Change", edited by Gert Verschraegen (University of Antwerp, Belgium) and Robin Vandevoordt (University of Antwerp, Belgium).

Published online: 27 June 2019

Abstract

European societies have been significantly challenged recently by intensifying debates around migration and integration. In Germany, the controversy around refugees has put the question of how to negotiate cultural differences back on the agenda. This article argues that female refugee support work volunteers in Germany have developed a compelling approach to handling cultural diversity in emotional, social and cultural practices. Building on interviews with female volunteers, this article demonstrates that research subjects' interaction with refugees is guided by an 'ethics of care'. Care ethics is characterised by the recognition of interdependence and relationships, attention to the context and to the particular, blurring of the public and the private and orientation towards the needs of others. The research subjects show that care values, such as responsibility and attentiveness, can serve as an alternative framework to integration and to the negotiation of diversity in everyday encounters. Data from quantitative studies on refugee support work in Germany then reveals that female volunteers politicise their care work to respond to racism and right-wing xenophobia. Ultimately, a political ethics of care has the potential to structurally, politically and emotionally change established understandings of integration and the relations between host societies and immigrants.

1. Introduction

In 2018 Germany's Minister of the Interior Horst Seehofer boldly declared "migration is the mother of all problems", causing an enormous stir among the German public. While right-wing and conservative opponents of immigration rejoiced, a union of the creative and cultural industries, migrant organisations and prominent politicians, even from Seehofer's own party, forcefully condemned the statement. This incident illustrated that in Germany, as in many other countries, heated debates on immigration and integration dominate the public discourse. The question of how to handle cultural differences remains a hotly debated issue that is still unresolved. This article enters the debate with a new perspective on the possibility of emotional acceptance of diversity. It argues that the feminist ethics of care provides a unique opportunity to render integration practices more compassionate, just and inclusive.

Developed in the 1980s, the ethics of care describes an alternative moral approach to traditional ethics that centres on relationships, responsibility and interdependence (Robinson, 2010). Scholars such as Joan Tronto (1993) and Selma Sevenhuijsen (1998) expanded its scope by outlining the implications of care for political and societal transformation. Others also demonstrated how care ethics can facilitate the relationship to other cultural groups, both at home and abroad (Held, 2005; Robinson, 1997; Scuzzarello, 2015; Sevenhuijsen, 1998). This article builds on these insights to demonstrate how care ethics could structurally change political propositions on integration and the societal negotiation of cultural difference.

For this purpose, I define integration as a process of social, cultural, structural and emotional/identificational inclusion and recognition, which involves both immigrants and the host society (Foroutan & Canan, 2016; Heckmann, 2015). While acknowledging structural and systemic barriers to integration, this article mainly focuses on emotional conflicts resulting from cultural difference. Cultural difference here stands for the diversity of social groups' norms, values, worldviews, beliefs and the resulting behaviours and practices which form a shared and historical system of meaning (Parekh, 2000). Following Stuart Hall (1996), I understand culture as a complex, ambiguous and constantly shifting social construct intersected by various other social dimensions such as gender or class.

Care-oriented integration is based on context-dependent and respectful dialogue that truly includes all voices, especially those that have so far been excluded in public discourse. Care values such as attentiveness, responsibility and responsiveness help recognise each individual's specific needs and design sensitive and flexible integration policies. Social relations characterised by these values could evoke empathy, trust and solidarity between immigrants and the host society and thus contribute to social cohesion and harmonious intercultural relations. This article provides a practical and empirical example of what a care-

oriented approach to integration might look like in practice through interviews with female volunteers in refugee support work.

After briefly outlining the current resentment of immigrants and cultural difference and why established concepts like multiculturalism fall short of providing a resolution, this article describes the central characteristics of the ethics of care. It then outlines a caring approach towards integration and cultural difference based on care-ethical principles in the political field. An empirical component, mainly analysing 22 qualitative interviews, follows which demonstrates how German female volunteers in refugee support work draw on the ethics of care to provide attentive and respectful care for refugees and interpret their voluntary care work as a political tool to achieve social change for more tolerance and openness towards refugees. Concluding this article is a discussion that consolidates the idea of 'caring integration' and considers various suggestions for policy change in current integration politics.

2. The Debate on Cultural Difference and Refugees

All over the world, immigration seems to be the issue of the hour. Many major political decisions in the last years, such as the election of Donald Trump for US president or the decision of the UK to leave the European Union, were substantially driven by concerns and fears about immigration. Right-wing populists in particular tried to exploit the so-called 'refugee crisis' to gain electoral success.

However, in Germany, by contrast, the general public and the media seemed at first to be exceptionally open-minded towards refugees. This 'welcome culture' was particularly visible through the creation of new organisations and spontaneous initiatives supporting asylum seekers (for a comprehensive overview see Hamann & Karakayali, 2016). As Karakayali (2018) maintained, the 'crisis' presented an opportunity for a large number of Germans to engage with migration first-hand. Indeed, Karakayali and Kleist (2016) revealed that the refugee support movement encompasses a broad cross-section of German society, including a large number of women and migrants. It also includes volunteers of all ages in urban and rural locations. Refugee support work not only represented a humanitarian care effort, it also provided a platform for often implicit political engagement (Fleischmann & Steinhilper, 2017), as this article demonstrates. In contrast to the widespread celebration of this unprecedented effort to help refugees, some critical voices pointed to unequal power imbalances upholding gendered and racialised colonial stereotypes, discourses of 'deservingness' and the paternalism often implicated in refugee support work (Braun, 2017; Holmes & Castañeda, 2016). Thus, refugee support work in Germany remains a complex and contradictory phenomenon, themes to which this article will add another perspective.

After an initial welcoming attitude to refugees in Germany, the discourse soon shifted to increasingly depict refugees as problems, threats and criminals (Vollmer & Karakayali, 2018). Consequently, the prevailing feeling about immigration currently seems to be one of crisis (Dines, Montagna, & Vacchelli, 2018). Building on longstanding resentment of cultural and racial differences, migrants and refugees are constructed as generalised threats to national security and culture. In this process, they become the principal targets for the myriad anxieties and rising discontent with politics in general (Holmes & Castañeda, 2016). In Germany, this discourse has a particular appeal, as up until 2001, the country refused to accept realities of immigration. Germans have long constructed their national identity as ethnically and racially exclusive and thereby set apart migrant and particularly Muslim communities as 'other' (Foroutan & Canan, 2016). In 2015, the influx of refugees led to a re-emphasis of this homogenous character of national belonging.

Moreover, as anti-immigration campaigns often include considerable backlash against multiculturalism and its proponents, the long-time dominant political frame for cultural diversity can be understood to be coming under fire too. Under the catchword of multiculturalism, rejection of difference as 'culture' has found its place where outward references to 'race' have become socially unacceptable (Lentin & Titley, 2012). Originally, the concept of multiculturalism emerged as a reaction to minority groups' increasing demands for public recognition in Western societies — seeking to politically, socially and legally accommodate national and ethnic identities within liberal democracies (Kymlicka, 1995; Modood, 2007). Resting on the basis of universal equality, this 'politics of difference' still respects the plurality of unique identities and cultural diversity (Modood, 2007; Parekh, 2000; Taylor, 1994).

Leaving aside the populist criticism of multiculturalism, the academic critique above all questions multiculturalism's rigid, homogeneous and bounded identity categories (Lyshaug, 2004). A variety of scholars have argued that multiculturalism risks neglecting internal variations in continually contested, fluid ethnic identities, and the complex power relations between and within groups (Anthias & Yuval-Davis, 1992; Hall, 1996; Scuzzarello, 2015). Consequently, a number of alternatives and further developments of multiculturalism have been proposed. This article aims to add the additional perspective of caring integration to academic discourses on multiculturalism. Some scholars of multiculturalism advanced 'interculturalism', which centres on intercultural dialogue and interaction to resolve multicultural conflicts (Meer & Modood, 2012). As I will demonstrate, interculturalism echoes many central ideas of the ethics of care.

Particularly pertinent for care-ethical approaches to culture is feminist literature on multiculturalism. While many feminists do support multiculturalism's demand for the recognition of social groups to address structural inequalities (Young, 1990), they point

towards multiculturalism's tendency to leave women vulnerable and unprotected when uncritically defending controversial practices of minority cultures (Okin, 1999). Some even claim that the multiculturalist celebration of diversity is a fantasy that obscures the real and systemic experience of racism (Ahmed, 2008). On a theoretical level, some feminists argue that more flexible, shifting and intersecting conceptualisations of identities illuminate the complex power dynamics between different categories of oppression such as race, class and gender (Anthias, 2002; Lyshaug, 2004). Interestingly, several care theorists draw on these scholars, particularly Iris Marion Young's work, to argue for the recognition of plurality inherent in care ethics and for a more complex model of responsibility (Conradi & Heier, 2014; Sevenhuijsen, 1998; Tronto, 2013).

As will be demonstrated, the ethics of care also seeks to empower those currently excluded by uncovering the power relations that construct them as subordinate. Based on sensitive dialogue, the ethics of care calls for the genuine consideration of each individual's specific needs and contexts, thus concurring with the demand advanced by Anthias and Yuval-Davis (1992) and others to move beyond rigid and homogeneous assumptions of group needs. To conclude, this article suggests that the ethics of care offers a persuasive, yet relatively unexplored further perspective on new strategies facilitating the integration of immigrants.

3. The Ethics of Care as a Key to Integration

3.1. The Care-Ethical Perspective

Care as a disposition or ethical value is intimately linked to the understanding of care as a practice. While there is no general agreement on the definition of care, Fisher and Tronto's (1990) broad conceptualisation constitutes a popular foundation. They define care as:

> A species activity that includes everything that we do to maintain, continue, and repair our 'world' so that we can live in it as well as possible. That world includes our bodies, our selves, and our environment, all of which we seek to interweave in a complex, life-sustaining web. (Fisher & Tronto, 1990, p. 40)

Accordingly, care is a deeply human process based on interdependence and relationality that takes place in public and private. Tronto (1993) further divided the process of care into four phases: caring about (recognising the existence of a need), taking care of (assuming responsibility for this need), care-giving (meeting the need) and care-receiving (the response of the object of care).

The ethics of care, then, concentrates on the moral dimension emerging from caring relationships among individuals (Robinson, 1997). In the wake of second-wave feminism, Carol Gilligan (1982) first popularised care ethics when researching the ethical contemplations of children. Whereas boys drew on an 'ethics of justice' based on fairness,

autonomy and rationality, for girls, relationships, empathy, concrete context and responsibility played a crucial role in their moral judgement — what Gilligan termed an 'ethics of care'. While Gilligan's experiments could not always be replicated (Engster, 2007; Skoe, Cumberland, Eisenberg, Hansen, & Perry, 2002), this 'first generation' of care ethicists was most profoundly criticised for reifying sexist gender stereotypes that confine women to the private sphere and the household (Hankivsky, 2014; Tronto, 1993). Gilligan (2011, p. 22) later addressed this criticism, however, when pointing out that "within a patriarchal framework, care is a feminine ethic. Within a democratic framework, care is a human ethic".

Consequently, the ethics of care developed into a multidisciplinary strand of feminist research expanding into a broad range of disciplines (Klaver, van Elst, & Baart, 2014). Most conceptions of care ethics today have the following characteristics in common: the central importance of relationships, recognising the context and particularism, transcending the private sphere into the political, appreciating emotions as moral tools, and grounding ethics in the empirical practice of care (Engster & Hamington, 2015; Klaver et al., 2014). Following the latter principle, Tronto (1993) deduced four fundamental ethical elements corresponding to the above-mentioned phases of care: attentiveness, responsibility, competence, and responsiveness. Other care ethicists have also emphasized the values of trust (Held, 2015), recognizing different points of view, empathy and compassion (Sevenhuijsen, 1998), and respect (Engster, 2007).

3.2. Envisioning Care-Oriented Integration

To utilise care-ethical insights for integration, this article mainly draws on the political re-orientation of feminist care ethicists of the second generation (Hankivsky, 2014), who aim at "developing a new political theory that can usefully guide analysis and action under contemporary conditions…[in an] increasingly interrelated and networked society" (Engster & Hamington, 2015, p. 7).

The political ethics of care was pioneered by Joan Tronto (1993), who argued that care has the potential to transform society and public life and represents a crucial element of democracy (Conradi & Heier, 2014). She added a fifth phase of care called 'caring with' that perceives citizens as interdependent and in need of care. Thus, 'caring with' shifts the main goal of politics "to ensure that all of the members of the society can live as well as possible by making the society as democratic as possible" (Tronto, 2013, p. 30). Democratic caring is based on the values plurality, communication, trust and respect, and solidarity. Responsibility for democratic care expands and includes collective action as well (Conradi & Heier, 2014).

Following Tronto, I maintain that care as a political theory needs to additionally inform ideas and practices of integration. Political care ethics is pivotal in today's superdiverse

democracies faced with the challenge of cultural difference. Indeed, Engster (2007, p. 4) observed:

> Care theorists have also thus far failed to address adequately the challenge of multiculturalism. Since most societies today are populated by individuals with diverse cultural and religious views, it is important to situate care ethics in relation to these diverse worldviews.

The following pages aim to contribute to closing this literature gap. To begin, care values are particularly well equipped in dealing with diversity and difference. In Sevenhuijsen's (1998) model of care-oriented citizenship, processes of public deliberation respect each person's individual view and take into account specific contexts. She argued that care ethics avoids the problem of citizens having to conform to an unrealistic 'sameness', or a shared identity. Instead, it positively values difference and relations to others, in ways similar to multicultural discourse. This is particularly important for those most obviously different to mainstream society: immigrants and refugees. Sensitivity to both culturally specific caretaking practices and needs, and non-intervention if a basic standard of caring is met, characterise care in a complex, multicultural social context (Clark Miller, 2010; Engster, 2007). Attentive dialogue and recognition of interdependence would allow for more inclusive, flexible, decentralised and responsive policies that meet the needs and perspectives of different individuals, supporting each citizen to live in society as well as possible (Engster, 2007; Sevenhuijsen, 2000).

By recognising today's complex global relationality, the ethics of care sheds light on and aims to reduce power imbalances. This is mainly done by empowering those without a voice and constructed as dependent on the global North (Robinson, 2010). By ideally listening to and taking seriously all voices, caring integration could potentially circumvent the ethnocentrism and paternalism that historically characterised Western attitudes towards other cultures (Held, 2005; Narayan, 1995). A caring integration that acknowledges racial and gendered inequalities hence involves formerly excluded actors in the public discourse and the shaping of public institutions (Conradi & Heier, 2014). To avoid unequal power relations, Clark Miller (2010) further contended that feminist care ethics does not solely prioritise meeting needs, but more importantly seeks to restore agency so that individuals can care for themselves. As opposed to multiculturalism, "care theory privileges not only the generic features of caring over cultural values, but also the care of individuals over group values and goals" (Engster, 2007, p. 99). By undermining binary constructions and being sensitive to intersecting positionalities, caring integration advances multiculturalism's exclusive focus on ethnicity to a more particularised perspective including categories such as age, gender or class (Hankivsky, 2014; Sevenhuijsen, 1998).

According to Sevenhuijsen (1998, p. 15), a caring society is “capable of dealing with the radical alterity of human subjects, through recognizing their individuality and diversity while at the same time conceiving of them as equals”. The latter becomes particularly important when confronting defenders of a ‘shared identity’, supposedly reducing antagonism by the dominant group. In contrast, care-ethical integration builds on civic caring virtues as a basis of societal interaction and cultivates emotional connection through empathy and trust towards those perceived as culturally different (Held, 2005). Care ethics transcends the personal or national frame, as the shared experience of being cared for has the potential to motivate even distant people to trust and respect each other. More explicitly, Clark Miller (2010) asserted that as fundamentally interdependent beings, we have a moral duty to care for each other individually, but also globally. This duty leads to caring relations within and between societies that encourage the solidarity underpinning welfare states and democratic institutions (Held, 2005). A caring global civil society rests on relationships between concrete individuals and attentiveness towards their real needs and replaces an abstract, impersonal and often unattractive cosmopolitanism (Robinson, 1997).

Engster (2007) further demonstrated how mutual dependency and the common experience of care provide a basis for intercultural dialogue and mutual obligation. As care ethics judges all cultural practices against the universal standard of good care, caring integration is particularly well suited to discuss anti-democratic practices or controversial issues, such as the right to circumcision or wearing a headscarf. As long as they do not impede the provision of minimally adequate care, individuals should be free to keep their cultural practices.

The ethics of care has a number of merits compared to multiculturalism and interculturalism. Notably, Scuzzarello (2015, p. 73) outlined a ‘caring multiculturalism’ that “sees individual and collective identities as relational, processual, negotiated and political, and…analyses and attempts to change the gendered power asymmetries embedded in intra- and intergroup relations”. Thus, caring multiculturalism replaces traditional multiculturalism’s rigid, unidimensional understanding of group characteristics and neglect of power relations. As this article also argues, Scuzzarello (2015) advocated for context-sensitive, fully inclusive multicultural policies, informed by care values and based on the real needs of those affected. Moreover, Zembylas and Bozalek (2011) indicated that care ethics has much in common with interculturalism as both emphasise dialogue and relationships, but care ethics goes even further by taking into account power relations, mutual dependence, vulnerability and larger-scale structural inequalities. Furthermore, interculturalism still relies on culture as its main variable of analysis, as the name already suggests. An intersectional care focus brings to the forefront interacting social positionalities as well (Hankivsky, 2014).

While Scuzzarello, Zembylas and Bozalek have proposed ways to improve multiculturalism from a caring perspective, they remained on a fairly abstract level and thus failed to anchor

theory in caring practices, a crucial element of the ethics of care. This article thus advances the theory of caring multiculturalism and integration by demonstrating what they could look like in practice. The following section traces how the ethics of care informs and influences relationships between the majority group and minority cultures in refugee support work.

4. Methodology

The following insights draw on 22 semi-structured face-to-face interviews with female refugee support work volunteers in four different locations in Germany—two bigger cities (Berlin, Hamburg) and two smaller towns. As attitudes towards refugees often seem more hostile in East Germany (Karakayali & Kleist, 2016), one of these towns is located in West Germany and one in East Germany. The fieldwork took place between May and July 2018. The volunteers, aged between 20 and 70, came from various occupational positions (e.g., students, working professionals, pensioners). The research subjects were part of a variety of refugee support organisations, ranging from self-organised initiatives set up spontaneously in-or-after the summer of 2015, to already established church- or school-based organisations that strengthened their existing efforts on refugee support work. Access to these research subjects was often gained through these organisations, with a coordinator or spokesperson forwarding my request and organising interviews, or through personally organised contacts. In a detailed initial letter, I highlighted my background and institutional connection, the aims of the research, the content of the interviews and ethical assurances, such as anonymity and data protection. Together with informed consent given prior to the interviews, this instruction contributed to the ethical soundness of the research. I was also open to answering any additional questions the participants might have, which a number of women made use of.

On average, the interviews lasted for roughly one hour, were conducted in German and concentrated on motivations to volunteer and prior expectations, descriptions of the voluntary work (including challenges or rewards), and the impact of the voluntary work on the women. Finally, topics such as integration, the current right-wing discourse or gender issues allowed for a more abstract, moral reflection. To avoid the reification of gender stereotypes, however, the latter were kept to a minimum and often emerged out of the participants' own accounts. Nevertheless, I followed Lofland's (1971) relatively open and flexible method of 'guided conversations' to more specifically focus on certain aspects when relevant or skip or change the order of the questions depending on the situation. While the research subjects were aware of the general objective of the study, researching volunteers' relations with refugees and their individual approach to refugee support work, I did not specify my theoretical approach of the ethics of care, as I both aimed to elicit unbiased, general and genuine responses and only developed the theoretical framework successively in a mix of inductive and deductive analysis. With consent, all interviews except one were digitally recorded and transcribed verbatim. The interviews were analysed successively with a detailed code frame

based on the theoretical review that encompassed care values, care-ethical principles and Tronto's five phases of caring. To ensure the privacy and safety of the participants, this article omits names and other identifying information. All quotations have been translated from German into English by the author.

Before demonstrating how care-ethical values guide the relationship between female volunteers and refugees, it is crucial to point out that the following section only highlights instances where the volunteers succeeded in adopting a caring approach. While I use those as best practice examples for a model of caring integration, in my fieldwork I observed several behaviours and statements that directly contradicted the ethics of care that I analysed separately. Moreover, I cannot be certain whether the volunteers truly acted according to their beliefs and declarations in the interviews.

5. Traces of the Ethics of Care in Refugee Support Work

First and foremost, the interviews revealed that female volunteers centrally build on relationships, the fundamental basis of the ethics of care. Many activities involved spending considerable time with refugees in sometimes relatively intimate settings. This includes, for example, accompanying refugees to doctor's appointments or court hearings, or tutoring children after school. As a result, the volunteers invariably developed close relationships and friendships with particular refugees, often highlighting the refugees' supposed emphasis on personal relationship as a cultural difference they admire most. They occasionally evoked family metaphors, for example in the sense of adopting refugees into the family and being seen as a part of the refugees' families:

> You belong to the family, they don't do things halfway. They don't have this American mentality, come visit us some time. Rather, they either immediately reject you.…Or they accept the help but then you're a family member, forever and ever.

Or as another volunteer remarked:

> They are very happy that I visit them at home. That is a kind of friendship, I would say. Then you talk, the kids, we tell each other our worries…I get along very well especially with the mothers, because I am also a mother myself.

This close relationality had a number of effects, such as developing trust, recognising similar worries and caring needs, and giving rise to a vigorous solidarity that led some volunteers to passionately fight to defend refugees in court or to public authorities. Consequently, when the conversation turned to values they follow in their voluntary work, the volunteers experienced fundamental empathy and obligation towards others. The friendships the volunteers developed increased this empathy-informed obligation and often further

strengthened their motivation. When asked whether she ever considered quitting, one volunteer responded:

> Somehow that wasn't an option. I have the feeling, once you got to know these people and when you understood the kind of situation they are in.…I was so much in this situation and somehow my whole life revolved around it.

The following selection of Tronto's, Sevenhuijsen's and Engster's care values played the most significant role in female refugee support work: attentiveness, responsibility, empathy, respecting different perspectives and respect. Attentiveness to the context and situation of each person in their particularity represents a central characteristic of caring integration. Similarly, instead of assuming a one-size-fits-all approach, the volunteers strived to understand the refugees' specific needs and to provide them with a sensitive and genuine solution. One participant, for example, recounted an instance where female volunteers collected cosmetics and similar feminine items overlooked by other volunteers as "you actually don't need them". They then brought this "women's box" of luxury items to the refugee shelter for female refugees. Another volunteer created a student research project with the aim of identifying the refugees' real needs, which resulted in the idea of an app that brought people together based on shared interests. Sometimes, when the women felt that services were not attentive enough towards the refugees' actual needs, they even stood up against the authorities or shelter operators.

Another value that played a central role in the women's voluntary work is responsibility. The importance of responsibility stood out most when the research subjects tried to explain their motivation to become involved in refugee support work. Repeatedly, they struggled to provide concrete answers and claimed that they just had to, that they saw an appeal for help or that the sheer presence of the refugees was enough for them to assume responsibility without many other considerations. One volunteer summed this up as follows:

> Whenever people and their social circumstances are involved, regardless of their background, I feel addressed. It was a very intense situation, an unexpected situation. You could almost say, actually, it was a crisis situation. And the first thing I thought of was, you have to do something. Many people just talked about it. But I had the feeling that you also really have to practically do something.

More specifically, some volunteers felt that their comparative wealth and privilege created a moral obligation to help those that are less well-off. This responsibility often sprung from the perception of shared humanity or humanitarian values connected to Sevenhuijsen's (1998) values of empathy and compassion. Some volunteers, for instance, pointed out that they did not specifically choose to help refugees, but saw them as people that needed support in general and would have been equally willing to volunteer for other groups in need.

Consequently, volunteers highlighted the importance of providing universal care while respecting different perspectives (Sevenhuijsen, 1998; Tronto, 2013):

> Because I consider life very valuable, I find that everyone should have the right to lead a happy life. And what that looks like for one or another, everyone has to define that for themselves. But I think we have, life is a gift we have to be thankful for.…That's something that I want to achieve in my life, this right to freedom, to peace, to be accepted, to a home. Maybe also a new home. And protection.

Turning to the power relations inherent in any caring situation, a remarkable number of volunteers attached vital importance to treating the refugees respectfully—a value highlighted by Engster (2007) and Tronto (2013)—as adults and 'on an equal footing'. This crucially involved attentive listening, perceiving them not primarily as refugees but as human beings, and appreciating different cultures and values. Many considered experiencing diverse perspectives a valuable reward of their voluntary work and subsequently started to question their own world-view and habits as well (see Sevenhuijsen, 1998).

This facet of caring refugee support work presents a suitable opportunity to further delve into the effectiveness of the care-ethical approach in conflictual intercultural situations, an aspect this article so far left aside. A very common aspect arising in almost all interviews was the experience of disappointment, anger or bewilderment when refugees did not show gratitude, did not conform to expected behaviours in their 'best interest' or even rejected the help of volunteers. Although these incidents often deeply affected the volunteers, many managed to overcome their hurt feelings and continue to help effectively by reminding themselves of their commitment to respect the refugees' individual standpoints and culture, and to be attentive to their complex and specific needs that are often obscured for those not similarly affected. Moreover, a care-ethical emphasis of relationshipshelped volunteers negotiate these situations when they sought talks with the other party or other volunteers. One volunteer recounted a fairly typical experience of helping to set up a flat for a refugee family. After she organised a number of essentials, such as mattresses for free, the family showed her a large flatscreen TV that they had just bought. Although the woman was deeply baffled and had to leave immediately, she later reflected the situation as follows:

> My priorities don't always have to be the priorities of other people, you shouldn't mix that up. I don't have to make others happy the way I am happy. There are so many differences between people.…And why should I interfere? I would perceive this as too arrogant myself.…But I was surprised, if I'm being honest, because I didn't consider myself so intolerant. These are moments when you question yourself.

To mitigate these power hierarchies and misunderstandings, many volunteers tried to involve the refugees as much as possible. Some saw their primary goal in capacity building and

giving refugees agency, so that ultimately, they could take matters into their own hands and were not dependant on help any more. This constitutes a crucial requirement of both integration theory and care ethics.

Still, it is important to note that the immense power differentials in refugee support work continue to have an effect due to the volunteers' positionality as white majority group members. They possess structural advantages despite any potential efforts to counteract these or feeling threatened themselves. Here, Hankivsky's (2014) intersectional ethics of care might shed a light on the complex interactions between different oppressive power structures, in this case, particularly the influence of race on gender relations that the ethics of care has often disregarded. For example, this intersection manifested in some volunteers' often unfounded fear of sexual assault by male refugees or their intentions to 'emancipate' female refugees they constructed as oppressed, which both point to ethnosexual and orientalist power mechanisms of race and gender (Dietze, 2017).

6. Potential for Structural and Political Change

The political strand of the ethics of care radically challenges the boundary between the public and private to achieve more fundamental structural and political transformation. This article argues that refugee support care work has political potential as well. Apart from providing efficient, sensitive care for those culturally different, volunteers also use their care work as an alternative means of political participation and a tool for expressing their political beliefs. One young volunteer was of the opinion:

> I don't think there's anyone who volunteers that doesn't also fundamentally have a political opinion on this….I do believe that it is a kind of statement to say, I play my part in helping here.

Ultimately, to a certain degree, the volunteers provide hints of how the idea of caring integration in their concrete work could also advance political approaches to refugees and immigrants in general. Interestingly, this political orientation has a strong gender component. This becomes apparent in the analysis of two quantitative surveys with German refugee support work volunteers from 2015 and 2016 with a total of 3,577 respondents that were contacted through German umbrella organisations in the field, thus ensuring limited sample selection bias. The results show that female volunteers are statistically significantly more likely to agree that through their voluntary work, they want to "take a stand against racism" (85% of female volunteers fully agree versus 76% of males) and "show that, besides right-wing populism and violence, a welcome culture also exists/acting against right-wing mobilisation in my city/neighbourhood" (77% of female volunteers fully agree versus 68% of males).

The qualitative interviews illuminate the concrete steps the volunteers took when aiming to establish caring integration approaches in their social environment more broadly. Being frustrated with how the refugee issue is currently handled politically, both on a local and national level, research subjects interpreted refugee support work as a particularly practice- and context-driven alternative to current policies and societal attitudes. As an illustration of alternative politics, some volunteers expressed consternation at the authorities' decisions on deportation. Instead of taking a refugees' whole situation into account, as the ethics of care would demand, research subjects perceived authorities as basing decisions on insensitive and highly generalised assumptions. Fear ing the deportation of her Gambian charges, one volunteer proposed:

> I understand that long-term, Gambians actually don't have a right to asylum. The dictatorship is officially abolished. Purely based on the law, I understand that they don't have a right to stay. But we need craftsmen, Germany too….They would only need to ask different independent people. I don't know how to organise this, but there should be a system. They should ask three people of AK Asyl [the refugee support initiative], they should ask three people from the town administration, they should ask the lady from the administrative district office, they should ask the lady from the AWO [another welfare institution]. And obtain the information: who is at school, who works, who makes an effort, who integrates themselves.

Another strategy directed at changing social attitudes toward more tolerance consisted of activities in public or hostile environments where volunteers consciously presented themselves openly with refugees. These activities ranged from taking refugees to public recreation spaces, such as to a lake or to a Christmas market, to organising festivals or private parties where refugees were invited in particular. The volunteers hoped that thereby, they could show others who are not already open to other cultures that refugees pose no threat and in fact feel and act similarly, as well as providing an example themselves on how to deal with refugees. Especially in the small towns, the volunteers occasionally risked antagonism and personal animosity when directly confronting friends and family, but they felt they had an obligation to strengthen welcoming attitudes on a larger scale. Many women interviewed considered this direct contact and concrete relationships as the best measure to truly understand other cultures. In their opinion, this could then lead to a more peaceful and respectful social environment and reduce the current culture of hostility. Similarly to the quantitative findings, for some women, refugee support work also functioned as a communal symbol expressing that refugees are welcome, and that Germany has a friendly, open and compassionate side as well.

Thus, in line with Tronto's case for democratic caring, the volunteers interpreted their care work as an opportunity for deeper cultural and political change in Germany towards a more

respectful and profound recognition of other cultural groups. While some volunteers interviewed had the feeling that they could, from the ground up, influence how some people in their environment thought about other cultures, others were rather pessimistic when faced with Germany's growing xenophobia. It remains to be seen whether caring refugee support work can lead to a long-term structural transformation of Germany's approach towards refugees, immigrants, and those perceived as 'other' in general. These topics, and others, are considered in the following section which analyses the consequences of a care-ethical approach to integration policies on a macro-level.

7. Discussion

On the basis of a political and multicultural ethics of care, and of the practice of care in German refugee support work, this article demonstrates how care ethics can enhance approaches to integration and cultural difference. The female volunteers interviewed showed how qualities such as respectful listening, taking into account the context and particular case, and assuming responsibility in concrete personal relationships, contribute to productive and amicable intercultural relations within a diverse society. Some of the volunteers related their care work to the public arena, hoping to achieve political and societal change as well. Hence, Tronto's (2013) conviction that care needs to become the centre of democratic politics also extends to contested social issues, such as integration. Basing social relations, citizenship practices and policies on care-ethical values has the potential to make political structures and the public sphere more inclusive both for immigrants and for other disenfranchised groups. Accordingly, Virginia Held (2015, p. 29) maintained that a global ethics of care "can contribute greatly to social change, to sensitivity toward and understanding of and willingness to take account of unfamiliar others and distant persons". In the long run, the ethics of care may provide a more effective framework for negotiating difference, cultural or otherwise, on a national and global level than current multicultural policies.

To conclude, I want to outline some potential implications for future research and political practice. This article substantiates care ethics' conflictive tension between demanding that all voices be heard but then only investigating and highlighting certain actors, mostly care givers, with a focus on Western practices (Lloyd, 2000; Narayan, 1995). Together with care's inherent danger of unequal power relations and paternalism (Williams, 2001), particularly in refugee support work, additional work on the perspective of refugees is urgently needed to do justice to the promise of a truly caring integration. This is critical towards illuminating the ambiguities, interrelations and conflicts that always accompany social negotiations from a feminist perspective. Additionally, this study purposely focused only on female volunteers and their specific approach to refugee support work. Thus, it inevitably relies on certain gender constructions that the ethics of care is based on. Studies on non-binary caring

practices and ethics are sparse (Hines, 2007) and future research should challenge the gender stereotypes inherent in this approach.

As Scuzzarello (2015) and Zembylas and Bozalek (2011) suggested, multiculturalism and interculturalism could be re-examined to include more sensitivity to intergroup difference and power relations, as well as grounding theoretical considerations in the real-life practice of those affected. Turning to political and structural consequences of a caring integration, first and foremost, all voices need to become part of the political and public discourse. Apart from relying on experts and leaders of migrant community organisations, policymakers should make more of an effort to seek out the opinion of those not organised in any official institution or potentially silenced in the existing structures. This includes getting input from migrant women, queer people and children. Summits like the regularly occurring Islam conference in Germany can not only invite leading Islamic unions and prominent individuals, as it has often done in the past, but also a more diverse array of Muslims. Structurally, more low-threshold meeting spaces for policymakers, but more importantly ordinary citizens, should be created to develop personal relationships with immigrants and refugees.

To a certain degree, in the last years a number of civil society initiatives aiming to connect mainstream society with newcomers have already emerged, particularly in refugee support work. As the participants of this study reported, however, these initiatives usually only reach those already interested in and open to different cultures and do not extend into the social spheres where they are needed most. In personal interactions, those not yet open to other cultures could learn to respect different customs, as long as they do not impede on the provision of adequate care, through cultivating empathic connections. Regional governments in particular are thus called upon to create new local gathering structures and to ensure sufficient funding for broader outreach campaigns.

Focusing on the group that receives most public attention, Foroutan and Canan (2016) showed that the German public consistently questions Muslim religious rights and thus denies Muslim citizens their due recognition. As demonstrated in this article, caring integration could shift the discourse to an appreciation of culturally and religiously different caretaking practices, while at the same time safeguarding good care for vulnerable individuals within ethnic groups. Moreover, similarly to the way right-wing politicians and media induced a fundamentally anti-immigration and nationalist dominant stance since 2015, the German discourse could be shifted back to a more humane, caring and respectful mindset. Politicians, educational establishments and media outlets could introduce more solidarity and empathy based on care practices into public discourse by setting an example in formal and informal communications.

Acknowledgments

I thank Serhat Karakayali and Olaf J. Kleist from the Berlin Institute of Integration and Migration Research for granting me permission to use the data of two studies on voluntary refugee support work in Germany.

Conflict of Interests

The author declares no conflict of interests.

References

Ahmed, S. (2008). 'Liberal multiculturalism is the hegemony—It's an empirical fact': A response to Slavoj Žižek. *Darkmatter*. Retrieved from http://www.darkmatter101.org/site/2008/02/19

Anthias, F., & Yuval-Davis, N. (1992). *Racialized boundaries: Race, nation, gender, colour and class and the anti-racist struggle*. London: Routledge.

Anthias, F. (2002). Beyond feminism and multiculturalism: Locating difference and the politics of location. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 25(3), 275–286.

Braun, K. (2017). Decolonial perspectives on charitable spaces of "welcome culture" in Germany. *Social Inclusion*, 5(3), 38–48.

Clark Miller, S. (2010). Cosmopolitan care. *Ethics and Social Welfare*, 4(2), 145–157.

Conradi, E., & Heier, J. (2014). Towards a political theory of care. In G. Olthuis, H. Kohlen, & J. Heier (Eds.), *Moral boundaries redrawn: The significance of Joan Tronto's argument for political theory, professional ethics, and care as practice* (pp. 29–50). Leuven: Peeters.

Dietze, G. (2017). Ethnosexismus: sex-mob-narrative um die Kölner Sylvesternacht [Ethnosexism: Sex-mobnarratives around the night of New Year's Eve in Cologne]. *Movements: Journal for Critical Migration and Border Regime Studies*, 2(1), 177–185.

Dines, N., Montagna, N., & Vacchelli, E. (2018). Beyond crisis talk: Interrogating migration and crises in Europe. *Sociology*, 52(3), 439–447.

Engster, D. (2007). *The heart of justice: Care ethics and political theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Engster, D., & Hamington, M. (2015). Introduction. In D. Engster & M. Hamington (Eds.), *Care ethics and political theory* (pp. 1–15). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fisher, B., & Tronto, J. C. (1990). Toward a feminist theory of caring. In E. Abel & M. Nelson (Eds.), *Circles of care* (pp. 36–54). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Fleischmann, L., & Steinhilper, E. (2017). The myth of apolitical volunteering for refugees: German welcome culture and a new dispositif of helping. *Social Inclusion*, 5(3), 17–27.

Foroutan, N., & Canan, C. (2016). The paradox of equal belonging of Muslims. *Islamophobia Studies Journal*, 3(2), 159–176.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gilligan, C. (2011). *Joining the resistance*. Cambridge, MA: Polity.

Hall, S. (1996). The question of cultural identity. In S. Hall, D. Held, D. Hubert, & K. Thompson (Eds.), *Modernity: An introduction to modern societies* (pp. 595–634). Cambridge, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Hamann, U., & Karakayali, S. (2016). Practicing Willkommenskultur: Migration and solidarity in Germany. *Intersections. East European Journal of Society and Politics*, 2(4), 69–86.

Hankivsky, O. (2014). Rethinking care ethics: On the promise and potential of an intersectional analysis. *American Political Science Review*, 108(2), 252–264.

Heckmann, F. (2015). *Integration: What makes it work?* Bamberg: efms papers.

Held, V. (2005). *The ethics of care: Personal, political, and global*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Held, V. (2015). Care and justice, still. In D. Engster & M. Hamington (Eds.), *Care ethics and political theory* (pp. 19–36). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hines, S. (2007). Transgendering care: Practices of care within transgender communities. *Critical Social Policy*, 27(4), 462–486.

Holmes, S. M., & Castañeda, H. (2016). Representing the "European refugee crisis" in Germany and beyond: Deservingness and difference, life and death. *American Ethnologist*, 43, 12–24.

Karakayali, S. (2018). The Flüchtlingskrise in Germany: Crisis of the refugees, by the refugees, for the refugees. *Sociology*, 52(3), 606–611.

Karakayali, S., & Kleist, J. O. (2016). *EFA-Studie: Strukturen und Motive der ehrenamtlichen Flüchtlingsarbeit (EFA) in Deutschland: 1. Forschungsbericht: Ergebnisse einer explorativen Umfrage vom November/Dezember 2014* [EFA study: Structures and motives of voluntary refugee support work in Germany. First research report: Results of an explorative survey of November/December 2014]. Berlin: Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin.

Klaver, K., van Elst, E., & Baart, A. J. (2014). Demarcation of the ethics of care as a discipline: Discussion article. *Nursing Ethics*, 21(7), 755–765.

Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Lentin, A., & Titley, G. (2012). The crisis of 'multiculturalism' in Europe: Mediated minarets, intolerable subjects. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 15(2), 123–138.

Lloyd, L. (2000). Caring about carers: Only half the picture? *Critical Social Policy*, 20(1), 136–150.

Lofland, J. (1971). *Analyzing social settings: A guide to qualitative observation and analysis*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing.

Lyshaug, B. (2004). Authenticity and the politics of identity: A critique of Charles Taylor's politics of recognition. *Contemporary Political Theory*, 3, 300–320.

Meer, N., & Modood, T. (2012). How does interculturalism contrast with multiculturalism? *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 33(2), 175–196.

Modood, T. (2007). *Multiculturalism: A civic idea*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.

Narayan, U. (1995). Colonialism and its others: Considerations on rights and care discourses. *Hypatia*, 10(2), 133–140.

Okin, S. M. (1999). Is multiculturalism bad for women? In S. M. Okin (Ed.), *Is multiculturalism bad for women?* (pp. 9–24). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Parekh, B. (2000). *Rethinking multiculturalism: Cultural diversity and political theory*. London: Macmillan.

Robinson, F. (1997). Globalizing care: Ethics, feminist theory, and international relations. *Alternatives*, 22, 113–133.

Robinson, F. (2010). After liberalism in world politics? Towards an international political theory of care. *Ethics and Social Welfare*, 4(2), 130–144.

Scuzzarello, S. (2015). Caring multiculturalism: Power and transformation in diverse societies. *Feminist Theory*, 16(1), 67–86.

Sevenhuijsen, S. (1998). *Citizenship and the ethics of care: Feminist considerations on justice, morality and politics*. London: Routledge.

Sevenhuijsen, S. (2000). Caring in the third way: The relation between obligation, responsibility and care in third way discourse. *Critical Social Policy*, 20(1), 5–37.

Skoe, E. E. A., Cumberland, A., Eisenberg, N., Hansen, K., & Perry, J. (2002). The influences of sex and gender role identity on moral cognition and prosocial personality traits. *Sex Roles*, 46(9), 295–309.

Taylor, C. (1994). The politics of recognition. In A. Gutmann (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition* (pp. 25–73). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Tronto, J. C. (1993). *Moral boundaries: A political argument for an ethic of care*. London: Routledge.

Tronto, J. C. (2013). *Caring democracy: Markets, equality, and justice*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Vollmer, B., & Karakayali, S. (2018). The volatility of the discourse on refugees in Germany. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, 16(1/2), 118–139.

Williams, F. (2001). In and beyond New Labour: Towards a new political ethics of care. *Critical Social Policy*, 21(4), 467–493.

Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Zembylas, M., & Bozalek, V. (2011). The Council of Europe's white paper on intercultural dialogue: An analysis using the ethic of care. *Policy Futures in Education*, 9(1), 13–21.

DISCUSSION

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

Taken together, this PhD research project demonstrates that female RSW volunteers draw on a political ethics of care to shape a successful relationship with refugees and overcome challenging situations and experiences of difference. Paper One shows that RSW can be understood as a form of care work and is therefore likely to be influenced by care values, as present in the ethics of care, as well. Moreover, women in particular also pursue informal, unconventional political aims in their voluntary work, namely standing up against racism and campaigning against right-wing mobilisation. Consequently, the paper demonstrates that female volunteers understand their involvement in RSW differently to men. Notions of care potentially draw women to this form of volunteering and play some part in their motivation to support refugees. However, women do seem to extend their private care work to the political, public sphere.

The second paper then concentrates on the qualitative fieldwork and shows that female volunteers establish bonds of sameness both through abstract reasoning such as referring to a common humanity, and everyday experiences like common interests or activities. In contrast, however, constructions of difference continually intersected their accounts. They are particularly visible in the domains of culture/ethnicity and gender, and reveal power structures and mechanisms between volunteers and refugees. The paper thus uncovers the central challenges of difference that social-psychological constructions of common identity cannot easily resolve.

Paper Three addresses the last part of the research aims and examines the ethics of care as a potential counteraction to constructions of difference. It thus takes up the themes identified in Paper One and the challenge posed in Paper Two, and brings them together by illustrating how the female volunteers employ care-ethical approaches such as attentiveness to the particular context or relationality to develop amicable relationships with refugees. However, the paper goes one step further and shows how the volunteers categorically politicise RSW. Thereby, they provide an inspiration for truly caring integration politics which could potentially represent an alternative strategy for the political and societal negotiation of diversity.

LIMITATIONS

Nevertheless, some limitations have to be noted. Most importantly, the design and sample of the research again perpetuate the much-criticised tendency to concentrate on the majority group and the care giver position, at the expense of the perspectives of disadvantaged minorities and care receivers which are often silenced in research and public discourse (Lloyd, 2000; Spivak, 1993). Therefore, the research can only speak about the constructions of RSW volunteers but is unable to contrast them with the experiences and perceptions of

the refugees themselves. As unequal power dynamics complicate RSW considerably (Braun, 2017; Fleischmann & Steinhilper, 2017; Masocha, 2015; Nowicka et al., 2019), it would be of utmost importance to include the views of refugees themselves in any future research.

Secondly, the ethics of care is most profoundly criticised for reinforcing traditional gender stereotypes that restrict women to the private sphere and connect them to typically feminised attributes like emotionality, relationality and caretaking (Sander-Staudt, 2011; Sevenhuijsen, 1998). By limiting itself to the views of female volunteers, this research again reifies the binary gender structure and runs the risk of perpetuating views of men as uncaring, which does not necessarily have to be the case. Indeed, numerous scholars have remarked that care is a crucial element in all humans' lives (Barnes, Branelly, Ward, & Ward, 2015; Engster, 2007; Gilligan, 2011). Additionally, intersectional feminists have criticised care ethics' tendencies to essentialise and romanticise the group of women (Graham, 2007; Hankivsky, 2014). In the publications above, I exercised special diligence when interpreting the findings for issues related to gender stereotypes, but they remain an inherent danger of the approach chosen. Unfortunately, due to low sample numbers it was not possible to include the group of non-binary volunteers in the quantitative study. It is also important to note that Carol Gilligan in particular has been criticised for methodological flaws when formulating her theory on a 'different voice'. Subsequent research has found mixed result for the association of care reasoning with girls and women (Broughton, 1983; Skoe, Cumberland, Eisenberg, Hansen, & Perry, 2002).

Moreover, it is important to note that the concept of caring integration, as the ethics of care in general, remains an abstract ideal that is unlikely to ever be completely reached in real-life settings and empirical fieldwork. Actual practice is, as mentioned, nevertheless an important element of the ethics of care and needs to be taken into account. As Paper Two demonstrates, the volunteer-refugee relationship is fraught with conflict that will always accompany any care relation, particularly in multicultural settings (Hankivsky, 2014; Lynch, 2015; Narayan, 1995; Raghuram, 2016a). Moreover, the ethics of care demand a wide-reaching redistribution of power in society (Conradi & Heier, 2014; Sevenhuijsen, 1998; Tronto, 1993), which would most likely generate violent counter-reactions by those currently in power.

Finally, this research project only focused on the emotional acceptance of immigrants on the part of the host society, but successful integration depends on a great number of other factors. For example, the research cannot generate any predictions or suggestions on structural barriers to integration, which potentially hinder successful integration as much or more than attitudes of mainstream society.

PERSPECTIVES FOR FUTURE RESEARCH AND POLITICAL PRACTICE

Consequently, the research project generates a number of suggestions for further research. First and foremost, as mentioned above, this project hypothesizes that the ethics of care might be beneficial for other groups as well, particularly in the current political climate. While the ethics of care is increasingly applied to a range of fields and cases, it has not been related to right-wing populist voters, the disenfranchised working class, or in Germany, East Germans yet. Connected to this, while both this paper and Scuzzarello's (2015) work have suggested some concrete changes to policy and political measures to be introduced, the question of how caring integration can work concretely at a policy level could be further investigated. For example, future research could test the transferability of care-ethical ideas found in the small-scale setting of RSW by applying them to actual legislation like the German Integrationsgesetz.

As noted above, more research on groups this study could not consider is also needed. Apart from the perspective of refugees, which has already been called for, it would be interesting to compare male volunteers, the general population who does not volunteer, other forms of voluntary or professional care work or volunteers in other areas unrelated to migration to the present findings. Particularly a comparison to the Germany-wide Freiwilligensurvey (Vogel et al., 2017), which is due to be repeated in 2019, would be instructive both to obtain more information on the socio-demographic differences of RSW volunteers and motivations and aims in related areas. Moreover, an examination of care practices of those not interested in or even opposed to refugees would be intriguing. Further building on the EFA-surveys, additional analysis could concentrate on other variables like 'born in Germany' and investigate potential intersectional phenomena. A similar undertaking in the context of the qualitative fieldwork would potentially require further interviews, but would also be very telling.

Furthermore, the results of this study so far have been published in journals aimed at gender studies and social issues like identity and inclusion. However, the results might also be interesting for other disciplines such as economics (for example regarding integration of refugees into the economy, women's unpaid labour), political science (focused on political participation, nationalism, right wing vs. left wing polarisation) or migration/integration studies (e.g. journals like the Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies). Moreover, it might be valuable publishing in more practice-oriented journals or magazines that reach working professionals and politicians in the field as well. In line with its interdisciplinary approach, by slightly changing the focal point of the issues this PhD dissertation concentrated on, the results could be further capitalised on for a wider variety of other journals and subject areas.

Finally, as mentioned above, the entanglement of gender and the refugee discourse still bears potential for future research. For example, the quantitative finding of this research that

women seem to be more interested in ‘other cultures’ would be interesting to examine further. Does it point in the direction of ‘feminine cosmopolitanism’ (Hamington, 2010; Nava, 2002; Stivens, 2018) elaborated on above, or does it rather indicate a form of paternalist, subtle racism as described by Braun (2017) and Narayan (1995), amongst others? Particularly the salience of sexuality remains under-researched. Sexuality emerged as a peripheral topic in some interviews, for example in the accounts of one volunteer who started a relationship with a refugee she worked with, or a middle-aged woman who had to defend herself against allegations of romantic interest in the young men she took care of. In the light of the immense debate on sexual assaults by refugees and indications of sexuality playing a role in right-wing populist support (Stokowski, 2018) and racist discourse (Hall, 1992) the role of sexuality in these discourses should be researched more thoroughly.

REFERENCES

Ahrens, P.-A. (2017). *Skepsis und Zuversicht. Wie blickt Deutschland auf Flüchtlinge?* Hannover: creo-media.

Alba, R. D., & Nee, V. (2003). *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Allport, G. (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice*. New York: Addison-Wesley.

Amir-Moazami, S. (2016). Dämonisierung und Einverleibung: Die 'muslimische Frage' in Europa. In do Mar Castro Varela, María & P. Mecheril (Eds.), *Die Dämonisierung der Anderen: Rassismuskritik der Gegenwart* (pp. 21–39). Bielefeld: transcript Verlag.

Andersen, M. L. (2010). The Nexus of Race and Gender: Parallels, Linkages, and Divergences in Race and Gender Studies. In P. Hill Collins & J. Solomos (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Race and Ethnic Studies* (pp. 166–187). London: Sage Publications.

Anthias, F. (2002). Beyond Feminism and Multiculturalism: Locating Difference and the Politics of Location. *Women's Studies International Forum*, *25*(3), 275–286.

Apitzsch, U., & Schmidbaur, M. (Eds.). (2010). *Care und Migration: Die Ent-Sorgung menschlicher Reproduktionsarbeit entlang von Geschlechter-und Armutsgrenzen*. Opladen, Farmington Hills: Verlag Barbara Budrich.

Aumüller, J., Daphi, P., & Biesenkamp, C. (2015). *Die Aufnahme von Flüchtlingen in den Bundesländer und Kommunen. Behördliche Praxis und zivilgesellschaftliches Engagement*. Stuttgart: Robert Bosch Stiftung.

Barnes, M., Branelly, T., Ward, L., & Ward, N. (2015). Conclusion: renewal and transformation – the importance of an ethics of care. In M. Barnes, T. Branelly, L. Ward, & N. Ward (Eds.), *Ethics of Care: Critical Advances in International Perspective* (pp. 233–243). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Beauvoir, S. de. (2011 (1949)). *The Second Sex*. New York: Vintage Books.

Beutel, A. M., & Marini, M. M. (1995). Gender and Values. *American Sociological Review*, *60*(3), 436–448.

Bhabha, H. K. (1983). The Other Question.: Homi K Bhabha reconsiders the stereotype and colonial discourse. *Screen*, *24*(6), 18–36.

Bock, J.-J. (2018). Migrants in the Mountains: Shifting Borders and Contested Crisis Experiences in Rural Germany. *Sociology*, *52*(3), 596-586.

Boulila, S. C., & Carri, C. (2017). On Cologne: Gender, migration and unacknowledged racisms in Germany. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, *24*(3), 286–293.

Branney, P. (2008). Subjectivity, Not Personality: Combining Discourse Analysis and Psychoanalysis. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *2*(2), 574–590.

Braun, K. (2017). Decolonial Perspectives on Charitable Spaces of "Welcome Culture" in Germany. *Social Inclusion*, *5*(3), 38–48.

Broughton, J. M. (1983). Women's Rationality and Men's Virtures: A Critique of Gender Dualism in Gilligan's Theory of Moral Development. *Social Research*, *50*(3), 597–642.

Brubaker, R. (2001). The return of assimilation? Changing perspectives on immigration and its sequels in France, Germany, and the United States. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *24*(4), 531–548.

Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge. (2019). *Aktuelle Zahlen zu Asyl: Ausgabe: März 2019*. Berlin.

Campbell, R., & Winters, K. (2008). Understanding Men's and Women's Political Interests: Evidence from a Study of Gendered Political Attitudes. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties*, *18*(1), 53–74.

Carens, J. C. (2013). *The Ethics of Immigration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Castles, S. (2010). Understanding Global Migration: A Social Transformation Perspective. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *36*(10), 1565–1586.

Clark Miller, S. (2010). Cosmopolitan Care. *Ethics and Social Welfare*, *4*(2), 145–157.

Cockburn, T. (2005). Children and the Feminist Ethic of Care. *Childhood*, *12*(1), 71–89.

Coffé, H. (2013). Women Stay Local, Men Go National and Global? Gender Differences in Political Interest. *Sex Roles*, *69*, 323–338.

Coffé, H., & Bolzendahl, C. (2010). Same Game, Different Rules? Gender Differences in Political Participation. *Sex Roles*, *62*, 318–333.

Conradi, E., & Heier, J. (2014). Towards a political theory of care. In G. Olthuis, H. Kohlen, & J. Heier (Eds.), *Moral Boundaries Redrawn: The Significance of Joan Tronto's Argument for Political Theory, Professional Ethics, and Care as Practice* (pp. 29–50). Leuven: Peeters.

Conway, M. M., Steuernagel, G. A., & Ahern, D. W. (2005). *Women and Political Participation. Cultural Change in the Political Arena*. Washington DC: CQ Press.

Cooper, D. (2007). 'Well, you go there to get off': Visiting feminist care ethics through a women's bathhouse. *Feminist Theory*, *8*(3), 243–262.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics. *The University of Chicago Legal Forum*, *168*, 139–167.

Culler, J. (1983). *On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism after Structuralism*. London: Routledge.

Currie, M. (2004). *Difference*. London: Routledge.

Datta, K., McIlwaine, C., Evans, C., Herbert, J., May, J., & Wills, J. (2010). A migrant ethic of care? Negotiating care and caring among migrant workers in London's low pay economy. *Feminist Review*, *94*(1), 93–116.

Derrida, J. (1982). Différance. In J. Derrida (Ed.), *Margins of Philosophy* (pp. 1–27). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Derrida, J. (2002 (1972)). *Positions: Translated and Annotated by Alan Bass*. London, New York: Continuum.

Dietze, G. (2017). Ethnosexismus: Sex-Mob-Narrative um die Kölner Sylvesternacht. *Movements: Journal for Critical Migration and Border Regime Studies*, *2*(1), 177–185.

Dines, N., Montagna, N., & Vacchelli, E. (2018). Beyond Crisis Talk: Interrogating Migration and Crises in Europe. *Sociology*, *52*(3), 439–447.

Dovidio, J. F. (2001). On the Nature of Contemporary Prejudice:: The Third Wave. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*(4), 829–849.

Einolf, C. J. (2011). Gender Differences in the Correlates of Volunteering and Charitable Giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *40*(6), 1092–1112.

Eisnecker, P., & Schupp, J. (2016). Stimmungsbarometer zu Geflüchteten in Deutschland. *SOEPpapers on Multidisciplinary Panel Data Research*, *833*, 1–13.

Ekman, J., & Amnå, E. (2012). Political Participation and Civic Engagement: Towards a New Typology. *Human Affairs*, *22*, 283–300.

England, P. (2005). Emerging Theories of Care Work. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *31*, 381–399.

Engster, D. (2007). *The Heart of Justice: Care Ethics and Political Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Engster, D., & Hamington, M. (2015). Introduction. In D. Engster & M. Hamington (Eds.), *Care Ethics and Political Theory* (pp. 1–15). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Erickson, J. (2012). Volunteering With Refugees: Neoliberalism, Hegemony, and (Senior) Citizenship. *Human Organization*, *71*(2), 167–175.

Farris, S. (2016). Die politische Ökonomie des Femonationalismus. *Feministische Studien*, *29*(2), 321–334.

Fleischmann, L., & Steinhilper, E. (2017). The Myth of Apolitical Volunteering for Refugees: German Welcome Culture and a New Dispositif of Helping. *Social Inclusion*, *5*(3), 17–27.

Foroutan, N. (2015). Die Einheit der Verschiedenen: Integration in der postmigrantischen Gesellschaft. *Focus Migration Kurzdossier*, *28*, 1–8.

Friese, H. (2017). *Flüchtlinge: Opfer - Bedrohung - Helden: Zur politisischen Imagination des Fremden*. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag.

Fuchs, G. (2006). Politische Partizipation von Frauen in Deutschland. In B. Hoecker (Ed.), *Politische Partizipation zwischen Konvention und Protest. Eine studienorientierte Einführung* (pp. 235–260). Opladen: Verlag Barbara Budrich.

Funk, N. (2016). A spectre in Germany: refugees, a ‘welcome culture’ and an ‘integration politics’. *Journal of Global Ethics*, *12*(3), 289–299.

Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1986). The aversive form of racism. In S. L. Gaertner & J. F. Dovidio (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 61–89). Orlando: Academic Press.

Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2005). Understanding and Addressing Contemporary Racism: From Aversive Racism to the Common Ingroup Identity Model. *Journal of Social Issues*, *61*(3), 615–639.

Gerstel, N. (2000). The Third Shift: Gender and Care Work Outside the Home. *Qualitative Sociology*, *23*(4), 467–483.

Giebler, H., & Regel, S. (2018). Who Votes Right-Wing Populist?: Geographical and Individual Factors in Seven German State Elections. *WISO Diskurs*, *14*, 1–25.

Giger, N. (2009). Towards a modern gender gap in Europe? A comparative analysis of voting behavior in 12 countries. *The Social Science Journal*, *46*, 474–492.

Gil-Lacruz, A. I., Marcuello, C., & Saz-Gil, M. I. (2019). Gender differences in European volunteer rates. *Journal of Gender Studies*, *28*(2), 127–144.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge, Mass., London: Harvard University Press.

Gilligan, C. (2011). *Joining the Resistance*. Cambridge: Polity.

Gilroy, P. (2000). *Against Race.: Imagining Political Culture beyond the Color Line*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press.

Graham, M. (2007). The Ethics of Care, Black Women and the Social Professions: Implications of a New Analysis. *Ethics and Social Welfare*, *1*(2), 194–206.

Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit Social Cognition: Attitudes, Self-Esteem, and Stereotypes. *Psychological Review*, *102*(1), 4–27.

Gunew, S., & Yeatman, A. (1993). Introduction. In S. Gunew & A. Yeatman (Eds.), *Feminism and the Politics of Difference* (pp. xiii–xxv). Boulder, San Francisco: Westview Press.

Gupta, S., & Virdee, S. (2018). Introduction: European crises: contemporary nationalisms and the language of “race”. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *41*(10), 1747–1764.

Hall, S. (1992). The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power. In S. Hall & B. Gieben (Eds.), *The Formations of modern society* (pp. 185–227). Oxford: Polity Press.

Hall, S. (1997). The Spectacle of the 'Other'. In S. Hall (Ed.), *Representation. Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices* (pp. 225–279). London: Sage Publications.

Hamann, U., Karakayali, S., Wallis, M., & Höfler, L. J. (2016). *Koordinationsmodelle und Herausforderungen ehrenamtlicher Flüchtlingshilfe in den Kommunen: Qualitative Studie des Berliner Instituts für empirische Integrations- und Migrationsforschung (BIM).* Gütersloh: Bertelsmann-Stiftung.

Hamington, M. (2010). Toward a Theory of Feminist Hospitality. *Feminist Formations*, *22*(1), 21–38.

Hamington, M. (2018). The care ethics moment: international innovations. *International Journal of Care and Caring*, *2*(3), 309–318.

Hankivsky, O. (2014). Rethinking Care Ethics: On the Promise and Potential of an Intersectional Analysis. *American Political Science Review*, *108*(2), 252–264.

Heins, V. M., & Unrau, C. (2018). Refugees welcome: Arrival gifts, reciprocity, and the integration of forced migrants. *Journal of International Political Theory*, *14*(2), 223–239.

Held, V. (2004). Care and Justice in the Global Context. *Ratio Juris*, *17*(2), 141–155.

Held, V. (2005). *The Ethics of Care: Personal, Political, and Global*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Held, V. (2015). Care and justice, still. In D. Engster & M. Hamington (Eds.), *Care Ethics and Political Theory* (pp. 19–36). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Helms, S., & McKenzie, T. (2014). Gender Differences in Formal and Informal Volunteering in Germany. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, *25*, 887–904.

Herd, P., & Meyer, M. H. (2002). Care Work: Invisible Civic Engagement. *Gender & Society*, *16*(5), 665–688.

Hernandez, J. (2011). The Changing Face of Ethics in the Workplace: Care and the Impact of Immigration Enforcement. In M. Hamington & M. Sander-Staudt (Eds.), *Applying Care Ethics to Business* (pp. 157–174). New York: Springer.

Hiddleston, J. (2010). *Poststructuralism and Postcoloniality. The Anxiety of Theory*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Hines, S. (2007). Transgendering care: Practices of care within transgender communities. *Critical Social Policy*, *27*(4), 462–486.

Holmes, S. M., & Castaneda, H. (2016). Representing the “European refugee crisis” in Germany and beyond: Deservingness and difference, life and death. *American Ethnologist*, *43*(1), 12–24.

Holtug, N. (2017). Identity, causality and social cohesion. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *43*(7), 1084–1100.

Holzberg, B., Kolbe, K., & Zaborowski, R. (2018). Figures of Crisis: The Delineation of (Un)Deserving Refugees in the German Media. *Sociology*, *52*(3), 534–550.

Hook, D., & Howarth, C. (2005). Future Directions for a Critical Social Psychology of Racism/Antiracism. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *15*(6), 506–512.

hooks, b. (1981). *Ain't I A woman: Black women and feminism*. Boston: South End Press.

Hughes, B., McKie, L., Hopkins, D., & Watson, N. (2005). Love’s Labours Lost? Feminism, the Disabled People’s Movement and an Ethic of Care. *Sociology*, *39*(2), 259–275.

Institut für Demoskopie Allensbach. (2017). *Engagement in der Flüchtlingshilfe*. Berlin: BMFSFJ.

Irigaray, L. (1980). When Our Lips Speak Together. *Signs*, *6*(1), 69–79.

Irigaray, L. (1994). *Thinking the Difference: For a Peaceful Revolution*. New York: Routledge.

Karakayali, S. (2017). ‚Infra-Politik‘ der Willkommensgesellschaft. *Soziale Bewegungen*, *3*(30), 16–24.

Karakayali, S. (2018a). The Flüchtlingskrise in Germany: Crisis of the Refugees, by the Refugees, for the Refugees. *Sociology*, *52*(3), 606–611.

Karakayali, S. (2018b). *Ehrenamtliches Engagement für Geflüchtete in Deutschland: State-of-Research Papier 09, Verbundprojekt 'Flucht: Forschung und Transfer'*. , Osnabrück: Institut für Migrationsforschung und Interkulturelle Studien (IMIS) der Universität Osnabrück / Bonn: Internationales Konversionszentrum Bonn (BICC).

Karakayali, S., & Kleist, J. O. (2015). *EFA-Studie: Strukturen und Motive der ehrenamtlichen Flüchtlingsarbeit (EFA) in Deutschland: 1. Forschungsbericht: Ergebnisse einer explorativen Umfrage vom November/Dezember 2014*. Berlin: BIM.

Karakayali, S., & Kleist, J. O. (2016). *EFA Studie 2: Strukturen und Motive der ehrenamtlichen Flüchtlingsarbeit (EFA) in Deutschland*. Berlin: BIM.

Kenworthy, J. B., Turner, R., Hewstone, M., & Voci, A. (2005). Intergroup Contact: When Does it Work and Why? In J. F. Dovidio, P. Glick, & L. A. Rudman (Eds.), *On the Nature of Prejudice: Fifty Years after Allport* (pp. 278–292). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Klaver, K., van Elst, E., & Baart, A. J. (2014). Demarcation of the ethics of care as a discipline: Discussion article. *Nursing Ethics*, *21*(7), 755–765.

Kukathas, C. (2003). *The Liberal Archipelago: A Theory of Diversity and Freedom*. *Oxford Political Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kulaçatan, M. (2016). Die verkannte Angst des Fremden. Rassismus und Sexismus im Kontext medialer Öffentlichkeit. In do Mar Castro Varela, María & P. Mecheril (Eds.), *Die Dämonisierung der Anderen: Rassismuskritik der Gegenwart* (pp. 107–117). Bielefeld: transcript Verlag.

Kunst, J. R., Thomsen, L., Sam, D. L., & Berry, J. W. (2015). “We Are in This Together”: Common Group Identity Predicts Majority Members’ Active Acculturation Efforts to Integrate Immigrants. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *41*(10), 1438–1453.

Kurtiş, T., & Adams, G. (2015). Decolonizing Liberation: Toward a Transnational Feminist Psychology. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, *3*(1), 388–413.

Leach, C. W. (2002). II. The Social Psychology of Racism Reconsidered. *Feminism & Psychology*, *12*(4), 439–444.

Lloyd, L. (2000). Caring about carers: only half the picture? *Critical Social Policy*, *20*(1), 136–150.

Lofland, J. (1971). *Analyzing Social Settings.: A Guide to QUalitative Observation and Analysis*. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing.

Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches by Audre Lorde*. Berkeley: Crossing Press.

Lynch, R. (2015). Paternalistic Care? In T. Schramme (Ed.), *New Perspectives on Paternalism and Health Care.* (pp. 115–125). New York: Springer.

Lyshaug, B. (2004). Authenticity and the Politics of Identity: A Critique of Charles Taylor's Politics of Recognition. *Contemporary Political Theory*. (3), 300–320.

Mahon, R., & Robinson, F. (2011). Introduction. In R. Mahon & F. Robinson (Eds.), *Feminist Ethics and Social Policy: Towards a New Global Economy of Care* (pp. 1–17). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Masocha, S. (2015). Construction of the 'other' in social workers' discourses of asylum seekers. *Journal of Social Work*, *15*(6), 569–585.

Meer, N., & Modood, T. (2012). How does Interculturalism Contrast with Multiculturalism? *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, *33*(2), 175–196.

Mohanty, C. T. (2003). *Feminism without Borders.: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. Durham, London: Duke University Press.

Mudde, C. (2004). The Populist Zeitgeist. *Government and Opposition*, *39*(4), 541–563.

Musick, M., & Wilson, J. (2008). *Volunteers: A Social Profile*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Narayan, U. (1995). Colonialism and Its Others: Considerations On Rights and Care Discourses. *Hypatia*, *10*(2), 133–140.

Nava, M. (2002). Cosmopolitan Modernity Everyday Imaginaries and the Register of Difference. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *19*(1), 81–99.

Nowicka, M., Krzyzowski, L., & Ohm, D. (2019). Transnational solidarity, the refugees and open societies in Europe. *Current Sociology*, 67(3), 383-400.

Okin, S. M. (1999). Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women? In S. M. Okin (Ed.), *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* (pp. 9–24). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Omwenyeke, S. (2016). Solidarität, kein Paternalismus. In Daniel Weber (Ed.), *Forum Migration Mai 2016* (p. 5). Düsseldorf: DGB Bildungswerk BUND e.V.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup Contact Theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *49*, 65–85.

Pettigrew, T. F. (2007). Social Identity Matters: Predictig Prejudice and Violence in Western Europe. In J. L. Peacock, P. M. Thornton, & P. B. Inman (Eds.), *Identity Matters: Ethnic and sectarian conflict* (pp. 34–48). New York: Berghahn Books.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Meertens, R. W. (1995). Subtle and blatant prejudice in Western Europe. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *25*, 57–75.

Pettigrew, T. F., Tropp, L. R., Wagner, U., & Christ, O. (2011). Recent advances in intergroup contact theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *35*(3), 271–280.

Porter, E. (2006). Can Politics Practice Compassion? *Hypatia*, *21*(4), 97–123.

Putnam, R. D. (2007). E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-first Century The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, *30*(2), 137–174.

Raghuram, P. (2016a). Locating Care Ethics Beyond the Global North. *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies*, *15*(3), 511–533.

Raghuram, P. (2016b). Migration and Feminist Care Ethics. In A. Sager (Ed.), *The Ethics and Politics of Immigration: Core Issues and Emerging Trends* (pp. 183–200). London: Rowman & Littlefield International.

Rattansi, A. (2012). From multiculturalism to interculturalism – a reply to the British political elite. Retrieved from https://www.opendemocracy.net/ourkingdom/ali-rattansi/from-multiculturalism-to-interculturalism-%E2%80%93-reply-to-british-political-elite

Robinson, F. (1997). Globalizing Care: Ethics, Feminist Theory, and International Relations. *Alternatives*, *22*, 113–133.

Robinson, F. (2006). Care, Gender and Global Social Justice: Rethinking 'Ethical Globalization'. *Journal of Global Ethics*, *2*(1), 5–25.

Robinson, F. (2010). After Liberalism in World Politics? Towards an International Political Theory of Care. *Ethics and Social Welfare*, *4*(2), 130–144.

Robinson, F. (2011). Care Ethics and the Transnationalization of Care: Reflections on Autonomy, Hegemonic Masculinities, and Globalization. In R. Mahon & F. Robinson (Eds.), *Feminist Ethics and Social Policy: Towards a New Global Economy of Care* (pp. 127–144). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Rommelspacher, B. (2002). *Anerkennung und Ausgrenzung: Deutschland als multikulturelle Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt/Main: Campus Verlag.

Rutherford, J. (1990). A Place Called Home: Identity and the Cultural Politics of Difference. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity: community, culture difference* (pp. 9–27). London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Rutherford, J. (2007). *After Identity*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Saharso, S. (2003). Feminist ethics, autonomy and the politics of multiculturalism. *Feminist Theory*, *4*(2), 199–215.

Sander-Staudt, M. (2011). Care Ethics. In J. Fieser & B. Dowden (Eds.), *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy.* Retrieved from https://www.iep.utm.edu/care-eth/

Sartori, L., Tuorto, D., & Ghigi, R. (2017). The Social Roots of the Gender Gap in Political Participation: The Role of Situational and Cultural Constraints in Italy. *Social Politics*, *24*(3), 221–247.

Saussure, F. d. (1949). *Cours de linguistique générale*. Paris: Payot.

Scuzzarello, S. (2015). Caring multiculturalism: Power and transformation in diverse societies. *Feminist Theory*, *16*(1), 67–86.

Sevenhuijsen, S. (1998). *Citizenship and the Ethics of Care: Feminist Considerations on Justice, Morality and Politics*. London, New York: Routledge.

Sevenhuijsen, S. (2003). The place of care: The relevance of the feminist ethic of care for social policy. *Feminist Theory*, *4*(2), 179–197.

Skoe, E. E. A., Cumberland, A., Eisenberg, N., Hansen, K., & Perry, J. (2002). The Influences of Sex and Gender-Role Identity on Moral Cognition and Prosocial Personality Traits. *Sex Roles*, *46*(9), 295–309.

Speth, R., & Becker, E. (2016). *Zivilgesellschaftliche Akteure und die Betreuung geflüchteter Menschen in deutschen Kommunen* (Opuscula). Berlin.

Spivak, G. C. (1993). Can the Subaltern Speak? In P. Williams & L. Chrisman (Eds.), *Colonial Discourse and Postcolonial Theory.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Stivens, M. (2018). Gendering cosmopolitanisms: Hospitality and the asylum seeker Other. *Women's Studies International Forum*, *67*, 85–93.

Stokowski, M. (2018, October 30). Hasen, ihr bleibt hier! *Spiegel Online*. Retrieved from https://www.spiegel.de/kultur/gesellschaft/wahlverhalten-von-maennern-sehnsucht-nach-klaren-verhaeltnissen-a-1235882.html

Stolle, D., & Hooghe, M. (2011). Shifting Inequalities: Patterns of exclusion and inclusion in emerging forms of political participation. *European Societies*, *13*(1), 119–142.

Sullivan, M. J. (2016). Legalizing Parents and Other Caregivers: Family Immigration Policy Guided by a Public Ethic of Care. *Social Politics*, *23*(2), 263–283.

Tajfel, H. (Ed.). (1981). *Human Groups & Social Categories: Studies in Social Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, John. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Monterey, Calif.: Brooks/Cole Pub. Co.

Themudo, N. S. (2009). Gender and the Nonprofit Sector. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *38*(4), 663–683.

Torres, C. (1998). Democracy, education, and multiculturalism: Dilemmas of citizenship in a global world. *Comparative Education Review*, *42*, 421–447.

Tronto, J. C. (1993). *Moral Boundaries: A Political Argument for an Ethic of Care*. London: Routledge.

Tronto, J. C. (2013). *Caring Democracy: Markets, Equality, and Justice*. New York, London: New York University Press.

Tronto, J. C. (2014). Moral Boundaries after twenty years: From limits to possibilities. In G. Olthuis, H. Kohlen, & J. Heier (Eds.), *Moral Boundaries Redrawn: The Significance of Joan Tronto's Argument for Political Theory, Professional Ethics, and Care as Practice* (pp. 9–26). Leuven: Peeters.

Tronto, J. C. (2015). Democratic caring and global care responsibilities. In M. Barnes, T. Branelly, L. Ward, & N. Ward (Eds.), *Ethics of Care: Critical Advances in International Perspective* (pp. 21–30). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Tudor, A. (2018). Cross-fadings of racialisation and migratisation: the postcolonial turn in Western European gender and migration studies. *Gender, place and culture*, 25(7), 1057-1072.

Turner, John C. (1987). *Rediscovering the Social Group: A Self-Categorisation Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Turner, John C., & Oakes, P. J. (1986). The significance of the social identity concept for social psychology with reference to individualism, interactionism and social influence. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *25*(3), 237–252.

Vehrkamp, R., & Wratil, C. (2017). *A Populist Moment?: Populist Attitudes of Voters and Non-Voters before the German Federal Election 2017*. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung.

Vogel, C., Simonson, J., Ziegelmann, J. P., & Tesch-Römer, C. (2017). Freiwilliges Engagement von Frauen und Männern in Deutschland. In J. Simonson, C. Vogel, & C. Tesch-Römer (Eds.), *Freiwilliges Engagement in Deutschland: Der Deutsche Freiwilligensurvey 2014* (pp. 637–646). Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Vollmer, B., & Karakayali, S. (2017). The Volatility of the Discourse on Refugees in Germany. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, *16*(1-2), 118–139.

Westle, B. (2001). Politische Partizipation und Geschlecht. In A. Koch, M. Wasmer, & P. Schmidt (Eds.), *Politische Partizipation in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland: Empirische Befunde und theoretische Erklärungen* (pp. 131–168). Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

Williams, F. (2018). Care: Intersections of scales, inequalities and crises. *Current Sociology Monograph*, *66*(4), 547–561.

Wilson, J. (2012). Volunteerism Research: A Review Essay. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *41*(2), 176–212.

Wilson, J., & Musick, M. (1997). Who cares? Toward an integrated theory of volunteer work. *American Sociological Review*, *62*(5), 694–713.

Zapata-Barrero, R. (2016). Theorising Intercultural Citizenship. In N. Meer, T. Modood, & R. Zapata-Barrero (Eds.), *Multiculturalism and Interculturalism.: Debating the Dividing Lines* (pp. 53–76). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Zembylas, M., & Bozalek, V. (2011). The Council of Europe's White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue: an analysis using the ethic of care. *Policy Futures in Education*, *9*(1), 13–21.

Zick, A., Küpper, B., & Krause, D. (2016). *Gespaltene Mitte – Feindselige Zustände: Rechtsextreme Einstellungen in Deutschland 2016*. Bonn: Verlag J.H.W. Dietz Nachf..

ABSTRACT

When from 2015 on, an unexpectedly large number of refugees arrived in Germany, civil society actors established numerous spontaneous initiatives to provide voluntary support where the state was unable to cope with the needs of newly arriving asylum seekers. In Germany, women comprised the majority of the volunteers. Both in light of the assumptions in much of the literature that women generally volunteer less, and the multiple axes of difference that the volunteers encounter in their work, this PhD project focuses on the experiences, motivations and attitudes of female volunteers in refugee support work (RSW) from three different but interrelated angles. Specifically, apart from investigating the role of gender in RSW, it studies constructions of sameness and difference and how the female volunteers resolve the latter in their daily work.

The first paper analyses two quantitative studies from 2015 and 2016 on German volunteers in RSW. It first establishes that RSW can be conceptualised as a form of care work influenced by care ethics, which potentially forms one motive for women to be drawn to this form of volunteering. Secondly, it becomes clear that female volunteers also interpret their voluntary care work politically and employ it as a tool to speak out against racism and right-wing mobilisation. The paper thus demonstrates that contrary to traditional assumptions in the literature, RSW constitutes a form of political participation for women and argues that care and politics are not mutually exclusive.

The second paper takes a closer look at the actual experience of female volunteers in RSW based on 22 qualitative interviews. Following social-psychological ideas of a common identity facilitating prejudice reduction, the paper first illustrates how the volunteers form bonds with refugees. However, in a second step it employs poststructural, feminist and postcolonial theory to demonstrate how difference continually intersects and disrupts these constructions of sameness, particularly along the themes of gender and ‘culture’.

Finally, the third paper takes up the political care ethics from Paper One and the challenge of difference from Paper Two and argues that female volunteers in RSW negotiate difference by following a care-ethical approach to integration. Based on the feminist ethics of care which centres on relationships and responsibility, the paper develops the theme of a ‘caring integration’. In addition, it investigates to what extent this notion can be found in the actual practice of female volunteers in refugee support work relying both on the quantitative and qualitative data.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Als ab 2015 die Zahl der Geflüchteten in Deutschland auf ein bislang ungekanntes Ausmaß anstieg, entwickelte sich bald eine ebenso beispiellose Mobilisierung der Zivilgesellschaft. Die vorliegende Arbeit beruht auf der Beobachtung, dass in der Geflüchtetenarbeit (GA) vor allem Frauen aktiv sind, entgegen dem allgemein festgestellten Trend, dass sich Männer häufiger engagieren. Sie stellt daher die Frage, welche Rolle Geschlecht in der GA spielt und wie die weiblichen Ehrenamtlichen ihre Arbeit mit den Geflüchteten erfahren und gestalten. Besonderes Augenmerk liegt dabei auf der Wahrnehmung von Unterschiedlichkeit und Gemeinsamkeiten. Ein dritter, daraus folgender Schwerpunkt liegt auf den Strategien, die weibliche Ehrenamtliche einsetzen, um Differenz in der Arbeit mit Geflüchteten zu überwinden. Die Dissertation ist gegliedert in drei zusammenhängende Teile.

Das erste Paper analysiert zwei quantitative Studien zu deutschen Ehrenamtlichen in der Geflüchtetenhilfe von 2015 und 2016. Es zeigt, dass GA als eine Form von „Care Work“ verstanden werden kann, die von Care-Ethik beeinflusst ist. Dies stellt möglicherweise ein Motiv für Frauen dar, sich besonders in dem Bereich zu engagieren. An zweiter Stelle ergab die Analyse, dass vor allem weibliche Freiwillige ihr Engagement auch als gesellschaftspolitischen Einsatz gegen Fremdenfeindlichkeit und Rassismus sahen. Somit argumentiert das Paper, dass GA entgegen traditionellen Annahmen in der Forschungsliteratur eine Form von politischer Partizipation von Frauen darstellt und dass „Care“ und Politik sich nicht gegenseitig ausschließen müssen.

Das zweite Paper konzentriert sich vorrangig auf die Ausgestaltung und das Erleben der direkten Beziehung mit den Geflüchteten und basiert auf 22 qualitativen Interviews mit weiblichen Ehrenamtlichen. Sozialpsychologischen Annahmen folgend, dass eine gemeinsame Identität zur Verringerung von Vorurteilen beiträgt, zeigt es auf, wie die Studienteilnehmerinnen Verbundenheit mit Geflüchteten herstellten. Demgegenüber betonen poststrukturalistische, postkoloniale und feministische Theorieansätze die unausweichliche Bedeutung von Differenz, die diese Konstruktionen von Gemeinsamkeit immer wieder durchschneidet und unterbricht.

Schließlich führt das dritte Paper den politischen Care-Ansatz von Paper Eins und die Herausforderung durch Differenz aus Paper Zwei zusammen und legt dar, wie weibliche Ehrenamtliche in der GA Differenz mithilfe care-ethischer Grundsätze zu Integration aushandeln. Das Paper bezieht sich auf Care-Ethik, die auf Beziehungen und Verantwortung als zentralen ethischen Maximen beruht und entwickelt die Idee einer ‚caring integration‘. Diese wird empirisch sowohl im quantitativen als auch im qualitativen Datensatz untersucht.